DECEMBER
1960

THE JOURNAL OF Higher Education

The Ethics of Scholarships

Auto-instructional Devices

The Ohio State University Press

THE JOURNAL OF Higher Education

ROBERT D. PATTON, *Editor*
EDITH C. RINEHART, *Associate Editor*

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

RICHARD D. ALTICK
DONALD P. COTTRELL
ROSCOE H. ECKELBERRY
EVERETT WALTERS
AURELE LA ROCQUE
CHAUNCEY D. LEAKE
ROBERT E. MATHEWS

EDITORIAL CONSULTANTS

JOHN S. DIEKHOFF, FRANK P. GRAHAM, MSGR. F. C. HOCHWALT
E. V. HOLLIS, HENRY W. HOLMES, CHARLES W. HUNT, A. C. KREY
L. C. MARSHALL, J. L. MORRILL, WILLARD C. RAPPLEYE, FLOYD W. REEVES
JOHN SHAPLEY, ORDWAY TEAD, LUTHER WEIGLE, JESSE FEIRING WILLIAMS
C. C. WILLIAMSON, JAMES M. WOOD

THE JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION is published monthly, except during July, August, and September, by the Ohio State University Press, Columbus 10, Ohio, 75 cents a copy, $6.00 a year (Canadian and foreign subscriptions $6.50). Second-class mailing privilege authorized at Columbus, Ohio. Copyright © 1960 by the Ohio State University Press.

NOTE TO CONTRIBUTORS: Manuscripts submitted for publication should be original typescripts, double-spaced, on white opaque paper, 8½ x 11.

THE MERSHON NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM
OF THE

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

ANNOUNCES AN

AWARD OF $2,500

FOR THE BEST BOOK-LENGTH MANUSCRIPT ON

NATIONAL SECURITY

DEADLINE FOR ENTRIES, APRIL 1, 1961

In offering this award, Ohio State University is seeking to create an awareness of the problems of our national security and to stimulate ideas which will contribute to their solution. Manuscripts need not be limited to a discussion of the military threat; they may be a treatment of other aspects of the problem—economic, political, ideological, scientific, or diplomatic. This award is a part of a larger program of education in national security sponsored by Ohio State through the generosity of the late Colonel Ralph D. Mershon.

Manuscripts submitted must be original typescripts, double-spaced, on white opaque paper, 8½ x 11 inches.

Manuscripts should be mailed to the Mershon Committee, Ohio State University Press, 164 West Nineteenth Avenue, Columbus 10, Ohio, on or before April 1, 1961.

Partially completed or proposed works are not acceptable.

The Committee reserves the right to withhold the award in the event that no work of satisfactory quality is submitted. The decision of the judges will be final.

The work which is awarded the prize will be published by the Ohio State University Press, and royalties will be paid to the winner.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE JOURNAL OF

Higher Education

Volume XXXI, Number 9 December, 1960

CONTENTS

The Ethics of Scholarship: A Discussion of Problems That Arise in Its Application — *A. Cornelius Benjamin* — 471

Auto-instructional Devices: Some Theoretical and Practical Considerations — *Robert E. Silverman* — 481

Professionalism and the Lotus-Eaters: Improving the Status of Teachers — *Carl Lefevre* — 487

Innovation in Higher Education — *Harold Enarson* — 495

SHORT CONTRIBUTIONS

Children of God — *Margaret Wiley Marshall* — 502

Staff-Study Regulations and Restrictions at the Ph.D. Level in American Universities — *Ralph E. Dunbar* — 505

EDITORIAL — 509

THE REPORTER — 512

REVIEWS — REVIEWER

Is the World Our Campus? — *David D. Henry* — 516

God Bless Our Queer Old Dean — *Fred H. Turner* — 517

What College Students Think — *Ordway Tead* — 518

The Junior College: Progress and Prospect — *H. Taylor Morse* — 519

INDEX OF VOLUME XXXI — 525

Telephone service has never been so fast, convenient and dependable as it is today

...and it's going to be better!

Two words—*growth* and *change*—describe major trends in the Bell telephone business. There is more of every kind of service for more people. And more and more new things coming along all the time.

Direct Distance Dialing is bringing a new era of speed and convenience in Long Distance.

Nearly 24,000,000 customers can now dial Long Distance calls direct to 39,000,000 telephone numbers in the U. S. and Canada.

New underseas cables make it easy to talk across oceans; as clearly as a call across town.

An entirely new era in communications for business is being opened up by the Bell System's Data-Phone service. It enables electronic business machines to "talk" to each other over regular telephone lines. Some day there may be more of those calls than calls between people.

Those are some of the new services. Just a few other newer things are shown on the right.

There's much more to come... from research and development, from the investment of millions of dollars of new capital, and from the Bell System's never-ending desire to give you the best and the most telephone service in the world.

CALL DIRECTOR TELEPHONE

With the touch of a button you can connect other office telephones, set up interoffice conference calls, add other office extensions to incoming calls. Two models. 18 and 30 push buttons. Many thousands already in service.

THE PRINCESS

It's little! It's lovely! It lights! A new compact extension telephone for any room in the house. A tremendous success all over the country. Available in distinctive white, beige, pink, blue and turquoise.

BELLBOY SERVICE

One of the newest Bell System services. A person away from the telephone hears a tone signal (sent from the telephone exchange) on a pocket radio receiver. Alerts him to call his home or office to get a message. Now available in 14 cities.

HOME INTERPHONE

Lets you call any other room in the house that has a phone. Or switch outside calls to another phone. Also lets you answer the door from any phone. Microphone in telephone and speaker beside each telephone enable person in other room to talk back without lifting receiver. Will be available nationally next year.

BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION Vol. XXXI No. 9 December, 1960

The Ethics of Scholarship

A Discussion of Problems That Arise in Its Application

By A. Cornelius Benjamin

THE dictionary defines man as a rational animal. We may safely assume, I think, that the authors of this definition had never witnessed television advertisements and had probably never taught college Freshmen. Furthermore, they must have known that through the long course of the history of thought man has also been defined variously as a moral animal, an aesthetic animal, an economic animal, a social animal, a political animal, and a religious animal—to mention only a few. Hence when they chose to define man as a rational animal, they were acting arbitrarily, thus proving that man is not rational after all. The fact seems to be that man is all of these, both in the sense that they are many facets of his behavior and in the sense that they all presume the more general definition of man as a preferential creature—a creature who more or less consciously sets up goals and then strives to attain them.

When man thus programs his life to the achievement of a certain value—knowledge, health, wealth, goodness, beauty—he soon discovers that some values are instrumental to the attainment of others. Through knowledge he can become wealthy, improve his health, and better appreciate beauty; through monetary values he can obviously extend knowledge and improve his standard of living; through religion he can often strengthen morality. Furthermore, he discovers that this distinction between instrumental and final values is clearly relative, since not only is money a means to health, but health is instrumental to adequate earning power; and not only does religion contribute to improved morality, but man's discovery of his own moral conscience may strengthen his belief in the existence of God. Implicit in this recognition is the reali-

A. Cornelius Benjamin *is J. H. Lathrop Professor of Philosophy at the University of Missouri.*

zation that some values cannot be solely instrumental, for if all of them were, and there were only a finite number of them, his attempt at constructing a rational theory of behavior would involve eternally chasing his own tail; and if there were an infinite number of values, it would necessitate an Achilles-like attempt to overtake a tortoise that was forever one step ahead of him.

Scholarship may be defined, for the purposes of this paper, as the pursuit of knowledge. Whether knowledge is considered to be intrinsically or instrumentally of value need not concern us here. In the former case, it is desired for its own sake, though it may require the use of other values in its attainment. In the latter case, it is purely and simply a tool—a tool to be employed in achieving greater physical comfort, an improved morality, a deeper religious experience, an increased patriotism, a happier social life, or any one of a number of other goals toward which man might direct his life.

Within this framework I should like to examine two questions. I am unable to say whether these are distinct problems or only two aspects of the same problem. The first is the question of what may happen to scholarship when it is employed as an instrument for the attainment of certain non-cognitive values. The second is the question of whether scholarship itself has an ethics, and, if so, what problems arise in its application.

LET us suppose, then, that scholarship is a tool. Now there are many objectives in life which we may prize, and which we may better procure through the instrumentality of scholarship. Some of the most common and most interesting of these are moral values. Self-esteem, for example, and even self-aggrandizement, are, within limits, praiseworthy ethical values. And one way to gain self-esteem is to become learned. But we all know scholars who are prigs. These people are offensive, not merely because they are prigs, but because they achieve their priggishness by abusing scholarship. They love knowledge only because its possession permits ostentation. They love learning only because it helps them to inflate their egos. They are educated, one might say, beyond their intelligence, for they know a great deal but are not intelligent enough to know that knowledge should not be paraded. Scholarship is being measured by something which is extrinsic to itself; it is not self-justified, but exists for something else. The risk is that it will suffer, since one can often be more pompous by being superficial than by being profound, by being loquacious than by being expository or informative, and even by being wrong than by being right. The situation is not changed, of course, if we substitute scholarly self-depreciation for scholarly conceit. Overhumility may be just as offensive as pedantry. In both cases scholarship runs the risk of becoming *un*scholarly simply because it is molded by something which is *non*-scholarly.

Consider another type of moral value. Patriotism and love of

country are, again within certain limits, virtues; disloyalty and treason are vices. Now let us suppose that I am an historian or a political scientist, and that I sincerely believe that a citizen may deepen his patriotism by learning more about the history of his country and the machinery and policies of his government. Clearly my scholarship may—there is no question here of "must's"—suffer as a result. Love is blind, as well when the beloved is my country as when it is my wife. I shall have to guard against looking at my country's past and present policies with a prejudiced eye. Unconsciously, I shall tend to overlook or minimize her vicious and blundering diplomacy, and I shall magnify and intensify her virtuous and clever negotiations. My history and my political science may then become propaganda, not scholarship. This, indeed, is the risk that must be run by all of the behavioral sciences. If they are pursued for the purpose of providing information, they may retain a certain measure of objectivity. But if they are used only to induce a certain preferred type of behavior (other than that of intelligent or informed behavior), they may degenerate into pure rhetoric. The risk is not merely that the mode of discourse will pass unconsciously from the informative to the persuasive, but that certain data will be unwittingly modified or even omitted entirely. One should be immediately suspicious of a scholar who believes in advance of investigation that something is good, and then is always able, through investigation, to prove that this is indeed so.

In this context, the question of disclaimer clauses and loyalty oaths inevitably arises. The issue might be summarily dismissed by saying that the government is worried about scholars as teachers, not scholars as scholars; the loyalty of students must be preserved, and the nature of the student-teacher relationship justifies the administering of oaths. To this attempt at minimizing the importance of the issue involved, the scholar may make two replies. In the first place, he may say that he is not a teacher *and* a scholar, but a teaching-scholar, which is something quite different. Therefore he cannot be asked to do something as a teacher which he would consider offensive as a scholar. In the second place, and much more important, he may say that a scholar who signs a loyalty oath prevents himself, in a sense, from accepting the full obligations of his scholarship and from going where it leads him; he promises not to explore certain areas because of what might turn up; his scholarship is predetermined by his value outlook rather than the reverse. One is reminded of the old-time preachers who talked much about sin, but always in very vague and general terms—the fear being, presumably, that if they described it more vividly, the congregation might be led to experiment with it and find out how much fun it really is. This is one of the problems that are perennial for the scholar. He investigates with enthusiasm—and, indeed, as a scholar he must do this—knowing full well that he will have to accept the outcome of his studies with the same enthusiasm, regardless of how distasteful it may be. He knows that

scholarship itself may compel him to discard pet theories and to drag noble standards into the dust, and he must be prepared for these unfortunate eventualities.

THERE are also cases in which scholarship is made subservient to certain values which might be considered other than moral. The welfare of our nation is, presumably, one such value. In recent years we have tended to formulate this value more critically in terms of national survival or national security. Many a scholar has directed his research, either voluntarily or under various kinds of pressure, toward a more adequate realization of this goal. As a result, what the scholar studies, how he studies it, and what the outcome of his investigations is, are all set by the initial problem. Does scholarship thereby suffer? Certainly not in all cases. If the United States Department of Agriculture sponsors research in soils for the purpose of increasing our crop yield, and thus our national wealth, there is no reason to believe that the scientist who carries on such studies is any the less a scholar.

But now let us assume that a scientist is studying guided missiles. There then results a very strange phenomenon—a geography of science comes into being. While there has always been such a study (since scientists must always be *somewhere* when they carry on their research), it has acquired a new and surprising meaning. Twenty-five years ago we meant by "Soviet science" and "American science" simply certain universally known scientific truths which happened, in the first case, to have been discovered by Russians, and, in the second case, by Americans. But today these phrases denote relatively large bodies of scientific truths known only to the Russians or only to the Americans, and protected from public dissemination by the most rigid controls. Scholarship that is motivated by national emergencies loses three of its most valued properties. In the first place, the scholar no longer selects his problem on the basis of his interest. His problem is assigned to him. He has taken on a taskmaster. In the second place, he must meet a deadline. Although this may not be a fixed date, it is there as a pressure, for we must overtake Russia in the arms race at all costs. This may modify scholarship in unscholarly ways. Textbooks on scientific methodology do not list practical urgency as one of the criteria for evaluating hypotheses. Finally, he is forbidden to publish the outcome of his research. To say that he may publish but that the information remains classified, is, in effect, to say that he may not publish, for the public character of the scientific information has been lost.

Much the same thing happens to scholarship when it is made subservient to economic values. Here it is commonly called "applied research," "practical science," or even "technology." What is produced has, of course, cash value. Industry is therefore eager to sponsor scholarship of this kind, and is willing to pay well for it. The scholar who is offered a grant is confronted with two problems. In the first place,

he must decide whether to retain his scholarly ideals and turn it down at the risk of starvation, or accept the offer and thus sell his scholarship for a full stomach. The present fact seems to be that the older scientists, who are used both to starving and to following their scholarly interests, usually take the former alternative; but the younger men, who are used to neither, choose the latter. There is a second difficulty. Practical science obviously depends on theoretical science. As Bacon expressed it, "Where the cause is not known the effect cannot be produced; nature to be commanded must be obeyed." But when the scholar engages in practical research, he is often trying to command nature before he has sufficiently obeyed her. This is not to deny that solutions in pure science may arise from problems in practical science. But what starts as a $50,000 idea in applied science often ends with a $100 idea in pure science. Michael Faraday attributed his success in physics to a simple formula, which he adopted early in his career—"Work, finish, publish." Presumably, he meant by this something like the following: Follow your curiosity and seek truth where it leads you; continue to pursue truth until you have found it; then tell everybody what your discovery is and how you achieved it. I am sure that there are many cases of industrially sponsored research which may approximate this formula, but I am impressed with the large number which obviously do not. A certain business executive once defined basic research as "when you don't know what you are doing." The rhetorical inelegance of this definition is exceeded only by its descriptive inadequacy.

The conflict between values is peculiarly sharp in the case of medical scholarship. Sinclair Lewis has made this truth classic in his *Arrowsmith*. Here the opposition is not between knowledge and some outside value but within the activity itself. The medical scholar has a split personality; he must know, but he must also do. One of his goals is complete knowledge of the human organism; the other is the survival and health of the patient whom he is treating. Suppose, for example, he is confronted by a patient who is critically ill. As a scholar, the doctor must diagnose the case correctly; as a practicing physician, he must save the patient's life. If, on the basis of a hurried and superficial examination, he hazards a guess as to what is wrong, he is indulging in "bad scholarship"; but he can then operate immediately if he wishes, and he may save the life of the patient. If he makes a thorough and time-consuming examination, he is behaving in a scholarly manner, but, because of the delay in operating, he may lose the patient. The fact is that operations can be successful even though the patient dies, for the surgeon performing the operation may learn a great deal. But he cannot plan the operation with this end in view—the risks to the patient must be considered.

Medical scholarship tries to resolve conflicts of this kind by devious routes. One is the method used in testing a promising new medicine. It is given first to rats; if they survive, it is given to monkeys; if they

survive, it is given to convicts in the state penitentiary; if they survive, it is ready for free human beings. The principle employed here is evidently a complicated one involving the cost, the availability, and the morals of the experimental subjects. But the ultimate principle is the undeniable value given to human life, or at least to that part of human life which manages to stay out of jail. Medical scholarship must serve two masters, and in doing so it frequently suffers.

Although the point which I am trying to make may now have become abundantly clear, I cannot leave the topic without mentioning an area in which scholarship has long suffered from domination by a foreign value, viz., religion. I am not concerned with the many effects on religion of the so-called conflict between science and religion. Nor shall I attempt to decide the hotly contested issue of whether faith precedes understanding or understanding precedes faith. The question here is simply the factual one of whether religion has in the past often misdirected scholarship, or deformed it, or deterred its development, or even killed it. A study of the history of scholarly martyrdom from Socrates to the Scopes trial makes the answer quite clear. This is not to deny that religion has frequently encouraged and promoted scholarship during periods when it might otherwise have disappeared completely. But the history of thought in this area is witness to the strong and lasting belief among men that scholarship should not be handmaiden to theology—or to anything, in fact, except scholarship itself. To argue that the devotion of the scholar to truth is only the manifestation of a higher religion—the true religion—is merely to complicate the issue by confusing the terminology.

WHAT conclusions may we draw from these considerations? May we say that the pursuit of knowledge with a view to some goal other than the satisfaction of curiosity always results in inferior scholarship? I do not think so. We can certainly say that it sometimes does this. But even this may be too strong, since the word *inferior* tends to suggest that instrumental scholarship is in some way bad and that pure scholarship is always good. If this were true, the scholar might then deliberately seek problems whose solutions could never contribute to any other good—in morals, politics, economics, health, or religion. He would then be like the famous mathematician who, after trying for twenty years to prove a theorem, finally succeeded and cried in glee, "Here at last, thank God, is a proposition of mathematics that no one can ever use." Perhaps it is noteworthy that some philosophers also have adopted this attitude. What should be recognized is that such a choice binds the scholar in the same way that subservience to any other end does; he seeks the solutions to his problems not because he is curious about them or because they satisfy his intellectual interest, but because they have no instrumental value of any kind. The end which he seeks is the absence of all practical ends; what he wants is a kind of knowledge which will provide

an escape from reality. His scholarship then becomes directed by a non-cognitive end, and his problems, methods, and solutions are selected accordingly. No doubt, if we could assure ourselves that a scholar had not selected his problems in this way, and that he had discovered the uselessness of his knowledge posterior to and not prior to his investigations, we might, perhaps, allow him the luxury of taking pride in this fact. But we should warn him not to boast about it, at least in the presence of the legislators or alumni who make his salary possible. Scholars who fall into this class cannot expect to lay up for themselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust do corrupt and where thieves break in and steal; they can look forward only to the pie in the sky when they die.

The only safe conclusion that can be drawn seems to be this: There are two types of scholars. One is impelled by curiosity and interest, and selects his problems and his methods accordingly. Often the problem with which he ends is not the problem with which he started, since research problems have the habit of leading to apparently unrelated problems. He prefers to take his time in his investigations and does not want to meet deadlines. When he has completed his studies, he desires to publish his results, because he considers them to be important in extending the boundaries of the known world and in providing his colleagues with an informational springboard from which they may leap into other realms of the unexplored. The other type of scholar thinks of a problem, not in terms of its interest for him, but in terms of some non-intellectual need for its solution. The problem and method do not determine the solution; the need for a solution determines the problem and method. He does not object, therefore, to having a problem assigned to him, to having his procedures supervised and directed, and to having his results confiscated. For why should he? The problem is not *his* problem.

Friedrich Schiller said that for some people knowledge is a goddess, but for others she is only a cow, milkable every day. I have been trying to say that we should not think of knowledge as a cow, because we shall then tend to determine her health by the palatability of her milk; and I believe that in order of priority, we should worry about the cow and let her take care of her own milk.

I TURN now to a consideration of the second question. Does scholarship have an ethics? Here we should try not to confuse two meanings of the words *good* and *bad*. If we say of a certain person that he is a bad bridge-player, we may mean that he fails to keep track of the cards which have been played, or that he trumps his partner's ace, or that he has not studied Goren. On the other hand, we may mean that he deals from the bottom of the pack or glances slyly into the hand of his opponent. We cannot clarify the distinction by introducing the word *ought*, because in both cases the player is doing something which he ought not to do. But I think we can distinguish, perhaps only roughly, between methods

which involve violation of accepted moral codes and methods which indicate incompetence and lack of skill. In the realm of scholarship, we might have difficulty characterizing certain cases; for example, carelessness might be action which is both incompetent and unprincipled. But in general there would be no problem in distinguishing, on the one hand, between such intellectual qualifications as the ability to read and write—which some of our scholars seem, unfortunately, to lack—the ability to use a library, to set up an experiment, to read certain foreign languages, to record information acquired in order to have it available at a later time, and, on the other, such moral qualifications as the obligation to publish, to acknowledge sources, to quote accurately, and to admit frankly the limitations of what one has done and the errors which it may contain. We commonly express the distinction by saying that the scholar who lacks the intellectual qualifications is *unskilled* or *inadequately trained*, whereas the scholar who lacks the moral attributes is *unconscientious* or *dishonorable*.

One might dismiss the problem of the ethics of scholarship by saying that it degenerates into a discussion of moral trivia. Certainly many moral arguments do become this sort of thing. Is lying wrong? Yes, of course. All lying? Well, no; big lies are wrong, but little lies are all right; and black lies are bad, but white lies are permissible; and lying about important things is definitely bad, but lying about insignificant things causes no harm, and so on. Does the consideration of the ethics of scholarship degenerate into this kind of moral hairsplitting? For example, should the scholar follow the example of the physician and formulate a Hippocratic oath beginning, "I hereby promise not to steal books from the library, not to cut pages from such books, not to mark or otherwise deface them"? One would like to say that in view of the nobility of the scholarly enterprise, a violation of this code would be a petty matter. But when one seeks a book at the library and finds that such a "minor" infringement has been committed, he may perhaps be pardoned if he becomes irate. Or, again, should we propose another oath (which we might call the "hypocritical" oath)—"I hereby promise never to accept any free books from publishers, never to buy books at professional discounts, never to use my publications as a lever to pry from the college administration a better salary for myself, never to accept royalties on my books or allow publishers to bid for my manuscripts, since what I write is not my own but belongs to posterity"?

FOR reasons which I think are probably obvious, I pass to my next point. From the more clear-cut ethical values which scholarship acknowledges, I select two for examination. One is the obligation to be objective, the other is the obligation to publish.

About objectivity there seems to be no question, either concerning its meaning or its moral worth. The scholar must be impartial, unprejudiced and fair-minded; he must report things as he finds them, not as he

wishes them to be; if he is defending a theory, he must present not only data which support it but also data which tend to disconfirm it; he must examine both his heart and his mind in the attempt to lay before himself and his readers the presuppositions which underlie his study. This seems to take care of the question of objectivity.

But we must not be misled by the ease with which we can formulate such a principle. In all areas of morality, it is much easier to state a code than to apply it. Indeed, in certain areas of the humanities, objectivity is not only unobtainable but undesirable. While we want to know accurately what the great products of the human spirit have been, we want also to know how they are evaluated by well-informed and critical minds. Thus an "objective" study of the humanities might well be as dull (and unscholarly) as a book review which merely reports the contents of a book and makes no attempt to appraise it. In the social sciences, objectivity, although it may be desirable, is almost impossible to attain. One might even say that the social scientist achieves objectivity only by ceasing to be social; for to be social, he must be emotionally involved with his fellow men; but to be objective, he cannot be. The physical scientist, on the other hand, is commonly considered to be the epitome of objectivity. He has thrown out the "base" and the "noble" metals, he no longer allows nature "to abhor a vacuum," and he does not permit water "to seek its own level." But he now discovers that in the microscopic world he can observe something only by changing it in the very process of observation, and in the macroscopic world he can specify nothing without bringing in his own frame of reference. Thus the relativity which was thrown out the front door has crept in again at the back. The biological scientist has been successful in ridding the terms *higher* and *lower* of the emotional associations which made the evolutionary theory so objectionable to the fundamentalists. But in the increased use of physical and chemical concepts, he finds himself confronted with the same relativity which is bothering the physicist. The psychologist appears to have progressed toward emotional neutrality in having replaced the soul by the self, the self by the personality, the personality by the ego, and the ego by behavior. But although this may be a gain for the behaviorist, it is a loss for the clinical psychologist, for whom the introspective method—surely the most subjective of all methods—is unavoidable.

THE second of the ethical values of scholarship is the obligation to publish. Again, the propriety of this obligation is seldom called into question. But carrying it out often involves the scholar in complicated casuistical problems. When, for example, should he publish? We all have among our friends scholars who publish at the drop of a hat—and what they publish often has about the same global significance. Others accumulate, revise, supplement, delete, emend—and the advancement of knowledge is held back by the perfectionism of the scholars. In what

style shall a scholar write? Shall it be one which will be sufficiently technical and refined to satisfy other scholars but leave the general reader confused and frustrated, or one which will communicate to the common man but will evoke from the author's colleagues bitter charges that he is sacrificing scholarship for royalties? When shall a scholar acknowledge sources? The answer is, always. And the ethical issue seems quite clear. Indeed, the violation of this principle is perhaps more heinous than that of tearing pages from a library book. The student who submits a term paper consisting of extracts from published works without benefit of quotation marks and footnotes has committed a truly dastardly crime, and a scholar who does the same thing and is caught by the copyright laws before he is caught by his conscience is simply not a scholar. I might add, in view of recent events, that a scholar who participates in a rigged quiz program and confesses only when he is caught by a Congressional investigating committee should hardly be surprised if his actions produce a feeling of nausea in scholars and moralists alike. But how hard it often is to know one's sources. Are they simply what one is reading when he gets an idea? And is the idea in the text or is it merely suggested by the text? And suppose one gets a new idea every time he rereads a book, as might well be the case if he is reading Plato or Emerson or Carlyle. Does scholarship which adheres to this principle then degenerate into an autobiographical account of one's intellectual adventures in a library? Must a scholar who writes a book on geometry make due acknowledgment to Euclid, and must a scholar who writes a book on atomic physics always cite Democritus?

SCHOLARSHIP, then, has an ethics, whose principles are well known and generally accepted. They are difficult to apply in concrete cases, both because they are not sharply defined and because there may be disagreement as to the seriousness of their violation in any given case. This should not surprise us, since scholarship is of many kinds, and, in any one of its numerous forms, it is a complicated affair. Perhaps it is no worse in this respect than business, or politics, or medicine. But the problem of how to apply the ethical code in the concrete case must surely be left to the scholars themselves. Only if they know what scholarship is, can they love it; and only if they love it, can they determine its duties and obligations. St. Augustine said, in substance, that the simplest way to solve problems of religious behavior is to love God. P. W. Bridgman claims that science consists in "doing one's damnedest with one's mind, no holds barred." When M. A. Rosanoff joined Thomas Edison's laboratory and inquired about what rules he would have to observe, Edison is reported to have replied, "Hell! there ain't no rules around here; we're trying to accomplish somep'n." Does scholarship have an ethics? Yes, a very simple one—love knowledge and do as you please.

Auto-instructional Devices

Some Theoretical and Practical Considerations

By Robert E. Silverman

In a provocative paper published in 1954, B. F. Skinner reintroduced the concept of teaching machines.[1] S. L. Pressey first introduced the idea in 1926, but because the *Zeitgeist* was not ready or because his writings lacked the persuasiveness of Skinner's, Pressey's ideas did not result in any extensive use of the new instructional method. However, in the six years since the publication of Skinner's paper, considerable interest in teaching machines has developed. All the interest is not confined to advocates, of course. There are also skeptics and Luddites, but few are indifferent to the idea of automated teaching and its implications for education.

The term "teaching machine" is unsatisfactory, for it is not accurate, nor is it sufficiently neutral to be simply a label. This new medium of instruction does not necessarily require actual machines; it also utilizes programed textbooks and paper-and-pencil devices. Furthermore, it has been pointed out by A. A. Lumsdaine and D. J. Klaus at the American Institute for Research that the term "machine" elicits antagonistic reactions associated with ideas of dehumanization and thought control. They suggest that the term "auto-instructional" would be more serviceable since it has fewer negative connotations and is more descriptive. The writer agrees with them, and will use "auto-instructional" in the discussion that follows.

An auto-instructional device is any device that can present systematically programed materials in the form of problems that require some action on the part of the student. All of the devices, regardless of their complexity, contain certain basic features: (1) There is a provision for presenting a question or a problem in response to which the student must construct, or indicate, an answer. (2) The student is informed with minimal delay whether his response is correct or incorrect. (3) The sequence in which the items are presented is controlled by the program. (4) The student proceeds at his own pace.

An auto-instructional device is limited by the program which it implements. Since these programs are prepared by teachers, the teacher's function is maximized rather than minimized. John W. Blyth, of Hamilton College, points out that the device is simply a means of

[1] "The Science of Learning and the Art of Teaching," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXIV (Summer, 1954), pp. 86–97.

Robert E. Silverman *is assistant dean of the University College of Arts and Science, New York University.*

"multiplying the effectiveness of skilled teachers."[2] The student can proceed at his own pace, the bright student moving rapidly, while the less gifted student tutors himself at a slower rate. The device does not duplicate a person-to-person relationship; but it does make possible a person-to-subject-matter relationship which is probably more efficient for certain purposes than that found in the classroom, where one instructor must deal with many students. In any discussion comparing classroom and auto-instructional techniques, a distinction must, of course, be made between lecture and discussion methods as they are employed in the classroom. However, all classroom techniques have certain disadvantages in common. (1) Students are not instructed individually. (2) One student may be entirely passive, another active. (3) Careful organization of material is ineffective when the student is inattentive and passive. (4) Although a student may be responding to the material that is presented, he does not receive immediate information about the correctness of his response, nor is he able to proceed at his own rate.

This is not to state that auto-instructional devices are generally superior to traditional methods of teaching. In fact, arguments about the general superiority of one method or another would be fruitless at this time. If we consider that learning requires motivation, information, practice, and transfer, then we can easily recognize that there is a place for all methods. Good teachers usually motivate their students, particularly at the college level. How many students have been so inspired by a lecture, only a part of which they completely understood, that they have hastened to the library to study the lecture topic! But what a waste it is of an inspiring lecturer's time to drill large groups of students in the general principles and nomenclature of a subject, for example. Such information can be better provided by auto-instructional methods or, in some cases, by a textbook. The classroom discussion or seminar can be exciting too, and thus motivating, but it also serves the purpose of developing concepts and extending the application of knowledge to new areas. Auto-instructional techniques can motivate the student by enabling him to observe himself acquiring knowledge and skills. These techniques not only provide information systematically but also give the student practice in the use and extension of the information accumulated.

ONE might suppose that the ultimate test of the effectiveness of auto-instructional techniques would rest on the results of studies comparing them with other teaching techniques. However, with the present state of teaching-machine programs in mind, many investigators argue that comparative control-group studies would be premature at present. They insist that meaningful comparisons can be made only when good programs and machines are available. This argument has considerable merit, but there is still a place for comparison studies even at this early date. Such comparisons may stimulate improvement in programing and machine design. The performance of a control group (taught by con-

[2] "Teaching Machines and Human Beings," *Educational Record*, XLI (April, 1960), p. 116.

ventional methods) can be used as a standard or base line against which to measure the effects of different programing methods and different types of machine presentation.

S. L. Pressey and his students made the first systematic studies based on comparison, using small, multiple-choice, punchboard devices. One such study was reported by J. K. Little,[3] who compared the multiple-choice device, an automatic test-scoring device, and conventional classroom teaching. The subjects for the study were college students, and the subject-matter was educational psychology. The two experimental groups (those using the multiple-choice device and those using the automatic test-scoring device) were matched with the control groups for intelligence and prior knowledge of the subject-matter. The findings indicated that both experimental groups achieved higher scores on a multiple-choice final examination than did the control group.

B. T. Jensen performed an experiment comparing twenty-four superior college students taking a special course in educational psychology with students taking the regular course.[4] In the special course, the students did not attend regular class meetings, but an "independent-study laboratory" was made available to them every afternoon which contained practice tests on a Pressey punchboard. Textbooks and page references were available so that students could check their incorrect responses on the practice tests. Laboratory instructors with whom the students could discuss any aspect of the course were present. When a comparison was made, it was found that the students taking the special course generally received higher examination grades than the regular students.

In a study like Jensen's, it is difficult to know what factors may have contributed to the superior performance of the students in the special course. They were superior students; they were encouraged to test themselves by using the punchboard device and to discuss course matters with each other and with the instructor; and they were clearly aware that they had been singled out for special attention. Any one, or some combination, of these factors could have accounted for the results. Jensen's study may have shown that superior students need not attend formal class meetings, but it tells us little about auto-instructional methods.

One of the most extensive of the early auto-instructional studies was made by S. L. Pressey.[5] In one series of experiments, Russian vocabulary, difficult English vocabulary, and psychology were the subject-matter taught. Pressey found that college students who took punchboard tests that gave them immediate knowledge of their scores showed some learning as a direct result of the test, and that repeating the same test was a practicable method of teaching. In a second series of studies Pressey compared three groups of college students taking a psychology course under different conditions. One group took punch-

[3] "Results of the Use of Machines for Testing and for Drill, upon Learning in Educational Psychology," *Journal of Experimental Education*, III (September, 1934), pp. 45–49.

[4] "An Independent-Study Laboratory Using Self-scoring Tests," *Journal of Educational Research*, XLIII (October, 1949), pp. 134–37.

[5] "Development and Appraisal of Devices Providing Immediate Automatic Scoring of Objective Tests and Concomitant Self-Instruction," *Journal of Psychology*, XXIX (April, 1950), pp. 417–47.

board practice tests; a second group took practice tests without the punchboard; a third group had no practice tests in any form. The results indicated that the punchboard and practice-test groups showed a slight superiority on a criterion test. A third and fourth series of studies further demonstrated that students who made intensive use of punchboard practice tests had higher final-examination scores than students who did not make use of this method.

MORE recent studies have concentrated on comparisons between the use of programed material and the use of conventional instruction. J. L. Evans, R. Glaser, and L. E. Homme, of the University of Pittsburgh, compared auto-instructional materials with those of a standard textbook.[6] In a series of three small-scale studies, they compared learning by the use of a standard textbook and learning with the aid of a programed textbook which presents items in panels that are read and responded to in much the same way as in the use of the automated devices. To confirm his answer, the student turns to a specific page and then proceeds according to instructions. The Evans, Glaser, and Homme findings offered some support for the superiority of the programed textbook.

At this writing, E. J. Kormondy, of Oberlin College, has completed one phase of a study of the comparative effectiveness of a teaching-machine program in basic genetics. The Kormondy study is paralleled by a similar study at Earlham College. The results of the first phases of both studies indicate that programed material is somewhat superior to non-programed material. Programed workbooks that require specific responses from the students and programed textbooks in which only reading responses were required were both superior to conventional non-programed methods.[7]

John W. Blyth has reported on an experiment in teaching logic with auto-instructional devices at Hamilton College. The students worked with auto-instructional materials and also attended class. In addition, a course textbook was available to them. In an anecdotal report, Blyth lists a number of advantages found in the use of programed material. The major advantages appear to be that (1) little or no time was wasted in the classroom on routine drill or on determining whether all the students were equally prepared for classwork, (2) greater classroom efficiency made it possible to devote class time to the development of concepts, and (3) students who might otherwise have failed the course were able to earn better than passing marks.[8]

A number of studies involving auto-instructional methods have been conducted with elementary- and secondary-school populations. In nearly all of them, auto-instructional methods were found to be superior

[6] "The Effects of Variations in the Properties of Verbal Learning Sequences of the Teaching Machine Type." Paper read at a meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association in Atlantic City, April, 1959.

[7] "Oberlin Experiment in Self-Instruction in General Zoology: Preliminary Analysis" (Oberlin College, December, 1959); "Earlham Experiment in Self-Instruction in General Zoology: Preliminary Analysis" (Oberlin College, February, 1960).

[8] "Teaching Machines and Human Beings," *Educational Record*, XLI (April, 1960), pp. 116–25.

to conventional methods. However, most of the investigators are reasonably cautious about their findings. In a study conducted with a group of eighth-grade pupils in Roanoke, Virginia, it was found that the students were able, without teacher, textbooks, or homework, to cover an entire year of ninth-grade algebra in one semester. In the report of this study, however, the following cautionary statement appears:

> We are, of course, extremely encouraged by these findings. However, we must hasten to point out that [they] are only suggestive and no definitive conclusions can be reached on the basis of these data. First of all, the results may have been due to a "novelty" effect; secondly, the size of the sample was very small and we do not know whether these findings would hold up in other school systems. Thus, these results should be thought of only as a tentative indicator that programmed material can be an extremely effective aid to the teacher in the teaching of high school mathematics.[9]

This quotation from the report of the Roanoke study might well be applied to all the studies that have been made. At best, the findings are only suggestive. "Novelty" effects have been prevalent, and samples have tended to be small and unrepresentative. These are familiar shortcomings in new research areas, where zeal and enthusiasm sometimes tend to overwhelm skepticism and momentarily obscure certain methodological problems. However, the auto-instructional movement has gone beyond the fad stage; it is a serious movement and is commanding the interest of mature scholars. If the early research has tended to be somewhat diffuse, a set of basic issues is beginning to emerge which is bound to generate significant research studies and to cast much-needed light on the question of the place of auto-instructional methods.

SOME of the basic issues involved in the use of auto-instructional devices concern programing methodology as well as techniques of measuring the effectiveness of different programs. Both of these questions have important implications for education. Programing methodology is essentially curriculum-planning on a small scale. In the course of programing it becomes necessary to analyze the subject-matter in great detail, and also to analyze the place of the subject-matter with respect to the curriculum as a whole. If it does nothing else, the auto-instructional movement performs a valuable service in forcing educators to define what it is they are attempting to teach, or, perhaps more accurately, what it is they wish their students to learn. Too often this is considered beneath the dignity of those in liberal education, who often draw a specious, and frequently false, distinction between education and training. We are told that training is an enterprise in which specific skills are imparted, and that education produces well-rounded, broad, aware, cultured, informed persons. The preceding list contains high-value words, words which elicit positive reactions from everyone, but which often cloak our ignorance. These words require definition and analysis.

[9] A. Calvin, "A Demonstration Class Using Teaching Machines for Ninth-Grade Algebra" (Roanoke, Virginia: Hollins College, 1960).

Such definition and analysis will not detract from the purpose of liberal education. It should sharpen our understanding of it so that we can evaluate and improve our teaching techniques.

THE question of evaluation has long plagued educators as well as students. If we were to assume that we had good definitions of what is to be learned, the question of how to measure performance would still remain. Here, too, the auto-instructional movement can perform a service, since researchers in this area are finding it impossible to ignore the problem of criterion measures. In most of the recent auto-instructional studies, the degree of learning is evaluated by some type of criterion test, usually objective in nature. Students are distinguished from each other on the basis of the number of items which they answer correctly. However, one of the strongest proponents of auto-instructional techniques, B. F. Skinner, contends that the basic criterion should be the amount of material learned, or, more precisely, how much of the course the student has mastered. Although some criterion tests may measure this, the results of most of them are affected by individual differences in intelligence or test-taking skills. According to Skinner, two students completing the same program should master an equal amount of knowledge, although it might take one student twice as long as another to complete the program. What Skinner is suggesting is that we should think in terms of subject-matter mastery rather than in terms of the vaguely defined grading criteria which we now employ in education. According to present practice, a grade of 75, or *C*, theoretically means that a student knows enough of the subject-matter to be permitted to pass on to the next phase. With auto-instructional methods, a student is allowed to go on to the next phase only after he has mastered the preceding phase. Thus, a grade shows how far a student has progressed. An *A* might indicate that he has mastered the whole course; a *B*, the first three-quarters of the course; a *C*, half of the course.

Although we do not know what the future role of auto-instructional methods will be, we can venture some predictions. All the present signs point to a series of vigorous research projects in the immediate future. To the extent that these projects deal effectively with basic issues of programing and the ever present question of measurement, they will provide information in a variety of educational areas. It is likely that they will be more significant than those conducted in the past. The questions raised should be sharper, and the answers less equivocal.

Predictions concerning the future of auto-instructional methods are complicated by many factors, however, all of which involve personal reactions. Those who accept the assumptions of the advocates of auto-instruction and are persuaded by the logic of their position are ready to use these methods immediately. Those who require empirical demonstrations of success will await the results of further research projects. A third group (hopefully, small) will, for reasons ranging from the capricious to the prosaic, accept or reject these methods on impulse.

Professionalism and the Lotus-Eaters

Improving the Status of Teachers

By Carl Lefevre

IT may be true, as college deans love to say, that a professor is a man who thinks otherwise. There is no doubt that some professors think otherwise than professionally about legal certification and accreditation requirements for teaching. They are the lotus-eaters among educators, whose quiet, deadly policy is to remain aloof from the battle. If they do not grasp the vital importance to themselves of truly professional status, by how much less do they comprehend its decisive importance—through academic disciplines, teaching, and learning—to the children and youth of our country, and thus, through the years, to the basic morale of America. As a result, the status of teachers today continues to be celestial diameters removed from that enjoyed in such self-respecting professions as law, medicine, and engineering.

The subprofessional status of teachers in our country is painfully reflected in the provisions and omissions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The official *Guide* to the Act[1] does recognize the need of procuring more and better teachers: college teachers (in fields other than English and the humanities) and elementary- and secondary-school teachers. But the unprofessional status of teachers is more than hinted at in the provision that a student who receives a loan to help finance his college education and later becomes a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school may be "forgiven" up to half the loan at the rate of 10 per cent each year for five years, after which time the debtor becomes liable for an equal amount each year. Certainly few of our most able young people will be attracted into teaching by such "forgiveness." To add insult to injury, a student applying for a loan is required, besides taking an oath of allegiance, to sign an "affidavit of disbelief," a provision so onerous that many of our eminent universities are dropping the program in protest.

These remarks about the nobly entitled National Defense Education Act are not meant to suggest that adequate funds, even for its limited purposes, were appropriated. Far from it. Altogether, it has the appearance of a campaign gesture rather than an "act"; it seems to imply that our federal lawmakers scarcely consider education a basic defense industry.

[1]Theodora E. Carlson, *Guide to the National Defense Education Act of 1958* (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959).

Carl Lefevre *is associate professor of English at Chicago Teachers College.*

Shall we face the facts? At no level has teaching ever been a profession in this country comparable in any way to law, medicine, and engineering. As far back as 1803, Samuel Knox, distinguished educator and contemporary of Thomas Jefferson in the American Philosophical Society, proposed the establishment of a "Schoolmaster's College" for the education of teachers, and a "Teacher's Asylum," not for the insane, but for the unemployed who would gladly teach.

Knox was seriously concerned about professional qualifications and the status of teachers:

> . . . The greatest impediment or obstruction to the progressive improvement of public Education in this . . . country, is the non capacity of the greater part of those who are entrusted with the instruction of Youth. It may be said, that most of them adopt the profession rather from necessity than choice; and consequently, have not made that literary preparation for the business which its importance requires.[2]

Now as then, teachers as a body are recruited from the lower-middle classes, where the meager pay and lowly status may actually serve as incentives to the mediocre. It is hard to see how the most able candidates can ever be attracted to teaching, however, unless it offers status and rewards comparable to those given for equal ability and preparation in other fields. In 1960 as in 1803, the cure is better education for better positions: truly professional status for teachers of all subjects and all grades.

What is a profession?

In Knox's day there were just three learned professions: law, medicine, and theology. But there has been a broad movement toward professionalism throughout American life. In 1955, a handbook issued by the U. S. Office of Education, *Education for the Professions*,[3] listed thirty-four professions, including teaching: all require college-level programs of study, many of them in excess of the usual requirements for the Bachelor's degree. This source lists three principal earmarks of a profession: (1) comprehensive study and training; (2) some measure of success in practice and rewards; and (3) associations that distinguish the qualified from the unqualified and admit to membership only those who measure up to acceptable standards.[4] Truly professional associations not only limit their membership to the qualified, but they also seek, and usually obtain, legislation to re-enforce their own requirements for certification in each state.

Of the many professions that limit membership in their societies by strict entrance requirements, probably the three nearest to college teaching in requisite ability and education are law, medicine, and engineering. Unlike subject-matter teachers at any level, these powerful professional

[2]"Essay on the means of improving public education" adapted to the United States (Colvin, Fredericktown, 1803), p. 4.

[3]Lloyd E. Blauch, editor (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office).

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 3.

groups participate decisively in the accreditation of educational institutions and programs and in the certification of individuals.

The American Bar Association conducts its business between annual meetings through an elected congress composed of a house of delegates and an assembly governed by a carefully drawn constitution. In addition to exercising power based on state laws determining the qualifications and activities of attorneys, the Association, through its Section on Legal Education and Admission to the Bar, exerts continuous influence on the requirements of legal study and practice throughout the country. One vital function of the Section is to publish authoritative lists of approved schools.

The American Medical Association likewise carries on its business between annual meetings through special sections, committees, and an elected house of delegates and a scientific assembly provided for in the constitution. Directly and indirectly, the members and the Association govern every phase of medical education. Each state has its licensing board authorized by medical-practice acts formulated in accordance with the advice and recommendations of the Association. No important legal position in medicine can be filled without the advice of that profession.

The engineering profession in America has also achieved a very high level of organization in a number of interlocking associations for the various branches. The Engineer's Council for Professional Development, sponsored by the national engineering societies, unifies minimum requirements for engineering education in the United States and Canada. The Council functions as an accrediting agency, issues lists of approved schools, establishes and administers codes of ethics and fair practice, and establishes and enforces minimum requirements for membership in the engineering profession. Moreover, each state requires individual engineers to be registered according to a strict set of requirements for each branch of the profession; the Council powerfully influences these requirements and tries to give them a national character.

Thus engineers, physicians, and lawyers (as well as druggists, foot doctors, horse doctors, and practitioners of dozens of the lesser arts), through their own associations and with the support of Congress and the state legislatures, have established requirements for accreditation of schools preparing candidates and standards for certification of individuals entering their professions. Contrast with this the fact that no subject-matter association of teachers is officially represented on any of the state or regional agencies which accredit teacher-education programs or establish certification standards for individual teachers. Eventually, those of us who will practice in all subject-matters in our schools, colleges, and universities should be required, at the minimum, to satisfy state professional-practice acts of our own designing, in line with unified national policies governing accreditation and certification in all disciplines. Only in this way can teaching become a full-fledged profession in this country.

One source of difficulty in projecting a unified policy on standards for the teaching profession is the internal disunity which exists at each level and the disarticulation among the various levels. University professors tend to organize themselves by rank and tenure in departments, using the unreconstructed Ph.D. degree, which they administer, as a minimum qualification for security and enjoyment of the psychic returns of college teaching. They have also devised other means of keeping younger and lesser faculty members mobile while they entrench themselves. This powerful hierarchy need not, and for the most part does not, feel a brotherly interest in the community of scholars, even in college teaching. Yet scores of their students qualify as teachers, and in turn send thousands of their own students on to the colleges and universities, where too many of these same professors complain that they find college Freshmen not properly educated.

Our professional corps suffers also from fragmentation into scholarly specialties represented by individuals seeking power and influence in rival professional journals and societies and within the ivy-covered walls of widely separated forts and outposts of academe. Add to this the rivalries among departments, schools, and colleges, including schools of education, of course, and you have a perfect culture for nurturing a creeping paralysis in the entire body of scholar-teachers.

Some of these fractions and fragments may be necessary evils. But if we do not plot a minimum area of common ground from which to address ourselves to accrediting and certifying agencies, we shall not deserve to be heard on policies and requirements vital to our professional development. Nor shall we be heard. Accrediting agencies in existence and still to be created will function without our wise counsel, just as they have in the past. Is it not obvious that a serious concern with certification and accreditation is a professional necessity for those of us who spend our lives teaching?

ALTHOUGH a taste for the lotus may be endemic to teaching, it sometimes seems to thrive most insidiously in English and the humanities, perhaps because of a specific cultural malaise. For example, a high-school student dares to excel in science and mathematics only at the peril of ostracism by his peers; and no one even considers becoming a poet. English and the humanities are the poor relations of the academic world, no less than of the great world. Nevertheless, the problem cannot be solved in terms of the humanities versus science—the have-nots versus the haves. The problem is profession-wide, and so must its solution be.

Ever since the first Sputnik soared into its man-determined orbit, we have all heard too much about the emphasis in Soviet education on mathematics and the sciences. I wonder why we hear so little about the considerable stress on Russian language and literature. In the Soviet ten-grade school system, corresponding roughly to our twelve-grade system, Russian language and literature receive by far the largest amount of the

total instructional time, about 28 per cent; mathematics, about 20 per cent; all of the sciences together (geography, biology, physics, astronomy, chemistry), about 20 per cent; and foreign languages, about 7 per cent.

Perhaps it would not be subversive if we gave substantially greater dignity in this country to the teaching of our own language and literature. Possibly, by doing so, we might reduce the appalling illiteracy of many of our high-school graduates who can neither read nor write anywhere near the college level. Most of our college Freshmen, after all, have received their education in the American twelve-grade system, public or parochial. It is a nasty fact that many teachers at all educational levels are not properly equipped for the work they are supposed to do. Their retention in our school system makes a mockery of those teachers who are well equipped and dedicated to their calling.

The status of teachers of English and the humanities is clearly reflected in the aforementioned National Education Defense Act of 1958. Throughout, almost exclusive attention is given to science, mathematics, and foreign languages (but to foreign languages conceived as tools, not as the great repositories and carriers of human culture). It is fair and accurate to say that there is no recognition of the deficiencies at every level in the teaching and learning of our language and the cultural heritage embodied in it. One does not find even lip service to humanistic disciplines; the Congress of the United States simply remained silent about them.

This degrading situation probably reflects the low esteem that humanists and their works enjoy nationally, a low esteem that our own reprehensible ignorance and neglect of professional certification might suggest we share with the real Philistines. Where were we during the hearings conducted by the Education Committee of the Senate and the House in the 1958 session of Congress? Exactly where we were years ago while the legal groundwork was being laid for inadequate certification requirements in many school subjects. Too many of us remained outside and above the battle, eating of the lotus blossom.

WHAT do the lotus-eaters have to say for themselves? Their objections to improving professional-certification requirements for teachers run somewhat as follows:

1. The values of our academic disciplines are too subtle and complex to survive an effort to reduce them to rule and formula.
2. Seeking legislative sanctions for teacher-certification requirements is an educational mistake; it represents one of the less worthy tendencies of educationism.
3. An alternative might be to consider certifying superior teachers through our own professional societies but without resort to law.
4. Superior and even distinguished educators, because of unwarranted course requirements in education, are excluded from positions for which they are eminently qualified.

5. Proven teachers are the only real authority for deciding who should teach. This applies to teachers of all subjects.
6. Therefore, let us abstain from all participation in attempts to determine certification requirements—above all, legal requirements. Let us simply remain silent on all such proposals, voting neither yea nor nay.

Whatever elevated rhetoric may cloak such rationalizing, it is still the rhetoric of the lotus-eater. This is a rationale for sitting on our hands in the face of danger, a counsel of despair that ignores basic facts of life in American education. Precisely such aloofness on our part has often left important areas of education undefended against determined attack by able proponents of the very tendencies of educationism our lotus-eaters affect to fear. A position above this battle is in fact suicidal; we are in it in spite of ourselves. Abstaining from action means yielding up the prize to the enemy without so much as an argument.

The authority of proven teachers is a many-splendored thing. It is even more splendid when channeled and articulated through professional societies, for all too often this pleasant criterion is corrupted by subjectivity and individual interest, or by institutional bureaucracy, or both. Then who is the proven teacher, pray, and who the pot? Lacking the discipline of a professional society, so-called proven teachers and their dearly beloved status quo may become so completely identified as to be indistinguishable from one another. Hierarchical servility and institutional time-serving may then become the desiderata-criteria determining the status "proven teacher." The proven teacher may simply be the one who has sat perfectly still longer than anyone else and thus acquired greater seniority.

For the teaching profession as well as for the state, government by law is preferable to government by men. Here, *law* means effective standards of professional preparation and performance, framed in accordance with the views of qualified educators. Such law would embrace the independent actions not only of professional associations, faculties, and institutions, but also of legally authorized administration (by boards, commissions, departments, and so on), as well as codes and statutes. Legislation on such matters is rarely passed without the advice and consent of some educators; there may, of course, be a real question as to which educators—or whose ox is gored?

What is needed at this juncture in our professional development is some tough-minded analysis. If we find inadequate or unreasonable requirements represented officially in statute and in office, then we can blame ourselves in large part for having lacked the good sense and foresight to avert this situation. One direct cause of the predicament in which we find ourselves has been the apathy of the lotus-eaters among scholar-teachers, who feel themselves above doing battle with their whipping boys, the educationists. Important values may yet be saved or restored, however, if we are ready and able to fight together effectively for

professional status for teachers under actual conditions as they are today. Victory in this battle, already joined, will require an all-out effort on the part of every teacher willing to enlist or be drafted, irrespective of academic discipline or grade-level, and regardless of organizational persuasion.

An excellent example of independent professional action in the sphere of the humanities was the adoption of an historic resolution in 1957 by the National Council of Teachers of English, "Minimum Qualifications for English Teacher Certification." Dealing exclusively with secondary-school teachers was probably a necessary expedient at that time, but sometime the more basic question of certifying language-arts teachers in the first eight grades must also be dealt with. The 1957 N.C.T.E. resolution has been adopted by numerous affiliated local and state councils, but so far only the College English Association has moved to give co-operative support nationally.

Here, then, a good beginning has been made on co-operation of professional associations to achieve national certification standards for English teachers. But it is only a beginning. Co-operation of the powerful Modern Language Association is needed, and of the Council on Cooperation in Teacher Education, a subsidiary of the American Council on Education. Co-operative parallel action by other subject-matter associations would be invaluable. As a long-range goal, all subject-matter associations should be officially represented in the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, the most influential agency in the field. In all these endeavors, we educators must broaden our view so as to comprehend every subject-matter and all educational levels as in a panorama or a continuum.

Ultimately, if we are to achieve a prestige and an influence commensurate with the noble tradition and the humane disciplines we represent, we shall need to envision, co-operatively with our colleagues in the American educational enterprise, a professional minimum educational attainment for all teachers in the United States. For, just as "no man is an Island, entire of it self," neither is any single discipline or any educational level fully understandable except as it is continuous with the whole educational and developmental process, from the child to the man. A teacher is a teacher is a teacher.

Some such understandings as those which follow are, I submit, fundamental to a grasp of the whole experience of becoming a man.

1. An understanding of human nature and growth grounded in a knowledge of biology and psychology
2. An insight into social institutions, including the family and community, based on an awareness of sociological principles
3. An understanding and appreciation of our political institutions, founded on a knowledge of history
4. An understanding and appreciation of our cultural heritage, and of the best in today's literature, music, art, and drama, both live and on film

5. An understanding of the role of science and technology in man's continuing conquest of nature and the physical universe
6. A firm knowledge based on study of the best procedures, and the known difficulties, in learning to read and to listen; to use numbers; to express thoughts and feeling through speech, writing, and other means of communication
7. A mastery of the skills of working with human beings—children and youth, especially—so as to elicit their best efforts and develop their highest gifts and potentialities[5]

These principles are suggested only as broad minimums and as a basis for discussion; they would in any case require more precise definition by the profession. But granted the desirability of a truly professional status for teaching, I wonder if it would be too much to ask all prospective teachers to demonstrate a reasonable command of some defined minimum of the knowledge and wisdom demanded by our great calling.

[5]These principles have been adapted from a statement made by the Council of State Governments in *The Forty-eight State School Systems* (Chicago: The Council, 1949), pp. 67–68.

Academic Round Table

Readers are invited to submit contributions to the Round Table and to suggest topics for future issues. Manuscripts should not exceed one thousand words.

MARCH, 1961 (Deadline, December 15)

Is consolidation among textbook publishers a threat to authors?

APRIL, 1961 (Deadline, January 15)

What qualities should a good graduate student possess?

MAY, 1961 (Deadline, February 15)

The Faculty Committee: Aid or Inhibitor in Achieving Educational Goals?

Is time spent on committees the necessary price of administrative democracy?
Could teaching and research be improved if all faculty time were devoted to these primary responsibilities?
Should faculty committees deal exclusively with policy matters, leaving administrative and executive tasks to administrators?

Innovation in Higher Education

By Harold Enarson

Innovation . . . is purposeful change by means of the systematic inquiry we call scientific method and of the new knowledge gained thereby. Innovation is clearly a result of the scientific breakthrough, that is, of the emergence of scientific method as fundamental method, and of scientific knowledge as a main tool of human and social action.

. . . . . .

Innovation aims at application; its goal is not knowledge in itself but effective change.[1]

Peter F. Drucker

A DISTINGUISHING characteristic of American life today is the rapid rate of change, a rate unparalleled in the history of the world. To a large extent, such change is not a fortuitous thing; increasingly, it is a planned, conscious process—not dreaded but welcomed. American industry spends large sums to stimulate orderly change—creating new products, new industrial processes, new marketing procedures, even whole new fields of human endeavor. The federal government, particularly the armed forces, invests huge sums in basic and applied research. Its objective: innovation, change.

Many of the techniques and some of the products of innovation can be traced to our colleges and universities. Our stock pile of basic knowledge is created in the universities. In a real sense, the university faculty members are the engineers, the philosophers, and the architects of change. Virtually every major innovation of recent decades builds on the work of the university community—Einstein's formula, the discovery of long-staple cotton, atomic fission, polio vaccine. Countless innovations revolutionizing American life and the American economy have emerged from a university setting.

Here we come to a paradox. Though the university community is a major force of innovation in our society, it is curiously resistant—even hostile—to innovations attempted within the university. The universities send out skilled specialists who spearhead purposeful change. The agronomist pioneers a revolution in agriculture; the economist adjusts the discount rate or remakes the economy of an underdeveloped country; the mathematician devises the theoretical structure for the construction

[1] *Landmarks of Tomorrow* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), p. 24.

Harold Enarson, *former director of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, is administrative vice-president of the University of New Mexico.*

of machines that supervise other machines; and the management specialist installs performance budgeting, modern personnel policies, operations-research programs, and the many devices which make big institutions work more effectively. But though specialists in the strategy and techniques of innovation crowd the campus, rarely are their skills brought to bear on the university itself.

Yet the average college or university has impressive resources within its own walls—economists, management specialists, experts in human relations, statisticians, specialists in the learning process. And what finer laboratory for their skills than higher education and the academic community itself! Is it not time that higher education drew upon its own best staff resources in turning the spotlight of intensive criticism upon its own habits and practices?

INNOVATION in higher education must extend to more—much more—than the use of IBM machines, televised courses, and a sprinkling of widely advertised experiments supported by foundation funds. The challenge to innovators is to examine the unstated premises and the comfortable routines of academic life. Let us look very briefly at four areas that are ripe for searching analyses and sweeping innovations: the number of courses, course content and method, class size, and the use of faculty time.

No discussion of the number of courses a college or university should offer can ignore the results of curricular growth. The plain fact is that proliferation of courses takes a heavy toll in faculty time, and hence in money, on many campuses. It is no exaggeration to say that the catalogue is out of control. The reasons are many. The explosion of knowledge is the root cause. New knowledge breeds new specialties, even new subspecialties. Most often it is the individual faculty member, with his knowledge and his aspirations, who creates irresistible pressures to add to the sprawling curriculums. Young or old, the faculty member wants to elevate and protect his own interests by shaping a new course. In part, this is a healthy tendency, permitting flexibility in curriculum and opportunities for developing new areas of knowledge; but more often, the addition of a new course merely fragments still further the organization of knowledge. Frequently, the combination of an ambitious professor and a hungry local industry proves irresistible. Harris Purks's delightful satire tells how a course on alligators grows into a full program, with special courses in such things as Alligator Farm Management and The Adolescent Alligator.[2]

Read the catalogue of any large university. The variety of offerings is impressive. What is lacking is the essential unity around core areas of learning without which a university degenerates into a giant cafeteria. On many campuses, committees are set up to restrict the addition of new

[2]James Harris Purks, Jr., "A New Course Is Born," *Journal of Teacher Education*, VII (September, 1956), pp. 201–205.

specialties and new courses. But the temptations of logrolling are strong, and it is a rare committee that has the necessary fortitude to call a halt. Surely the catalogue offers a prime target for imaginative change, for planned innovation.

Let us turn next to course content and methods. Recently the President's Science Advisory Committee emphasized the need to revise syllabuses and to provide teaching aids, arguing that of all the concrete actions that might be taken to improve education in the United States, whether in the first grade or the last year of college, these are by all odds the most urgent and most attainable. Though the average college teacher might agree in principle, he generally stoutly resists any effort to reshape course content or to develop new teaching methods.

In large part, teaching skills are developed on a catch-as-catch-can basis. At best, there is a master-apprentice relationship, the young teacher emulating his own instructors. It is often assumed that nothing—absolutely nothing—is to be learned from the schools of education or, for that matter, from the departments of psychology about the learning process. Teaching, it is alleged, is a mystic art, one basically not communicable. The individual teacher, whether he is the senior member of a department or a newcomer, is the unquestioned lord of his domain—his classroom. He is presumed to know the best teaching methods for his subject-matter without previous assistance or supervision. Neither he nor his department is expected to investigate the question of the most appropriate methods and tools for a given teaching situation. Teachers use lectures because the teachers who taught them lectured. And they require certain laboratory experiences either because these appear in the laboratory manual or because they are traditional.

Faculty resistance to new teaching methods approaches fever heat when television is considered. With few exceptions, faculty members overwhelmingly prefer the familiar lecture method to a television performance before a battery of blazing lights. Part of their resistance may be charged to misinformation, part to fear of change and of the unknown, and part to a deep conviction that anything which threatens the direct personal contact of a teacher with his student is an invitation to educational disaster.

Many college teachers look with suspicion, and even hostility, on the new or unusual in teaching, much as the scholars of an earlier day considered the printing press dangerous and the science laboratory a frivolous waste of time. Such skepticism can stultify change; and this is precisely what is happening on many campuses today. Yet course content and method go to the heart of teaching efficiency. Innovation in the area of course content and teaching method is imperative.

The student-teacher ratio is a perennial problem. Small classes somehow tend to be equated with quality instruction. In colleges and universities throughout the land, faculty members seek to protect standards by resisting upward changes in the faculty-student ratio. If

class size were purely an academic issue, this would not be serious. However, there are several reasons why it is of major practical importance.

First, as enrollments double and triple, there will not be enough qualified teachers to maintain existing ratios. Because of their favorable financial position, some institutions will be able to hedge on the shortage of teachers. However, most colleges have an unwarranted illusion of institutional immunity; they feel that "it can't happen here," even though the arithmetic of teacher supply and demand indicates that any notion of immunity is based on shaky grounds. Raiding of faculties will accelerate the rate of job change, but it will not increase the supply of teachers.

Second, class size is inescapably linked with teacher productivity. That productivity and salary levels go hand in hand is amply illustrated by Ruml and Morrison's "Models of the Possible"; their illustrations of major faculty-salary increases made possible by raising the student-teacher ratio are too impressive to ignore.[3] If the same number of faculty members can handle larger numbers of students, savings are obviously possible. And if savings are passed on to the faculty in the form of salary increases, it is apparent that class size, productivity, and salaries can be linked to the advantage of the faculty.[4]

Educational leaders must systematically seek answers to such specific questions as the following: What is the optimal teaching method for each subject area at each level of specialization? Are there differences in the appropriate class size for skill courses (such as accounting) and for courses that should involve the student's personal value system (such as American government)? What is the optimal class size for a lecture presentation? For a survey course? For a skill course? What is best for a seminar in philosophy? In short, class size cannot be taken for granted. A vague faith in traditional class size is not enough. Innovations in class size promise rich dividends in the form of savings, or better instruction, or both.

A fourth area in which changes could profitably be made is the use of faculty time. The skilled and dedicated teacher is our most valued educational resource—so colleges and universities keep saying. But they do not behave as if this were true. They are prodigal in the use of faculty talent. The average faculty member serves on a number of time-consuming committees dealing with such non-academic questions as who shall have a telephone or where students shall park; he shares his office with one or more colleagues; he does his own typing and routine clerical work and cleaning up after experiments; he endures every kind of distraction.

[3]Beardsley Ruml and Donald H. Morrison, *Memo to a College Trustee: A Report on Financial and Structural Problems of the Liberal College* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), pp. 27–44.

[4]This has already happened in New Mexico, which had a faculty ratio of 13 to 1 in 1952. The ratio was pushed upward, and savings were invested in salaries. In six years, the state-wide ratio was raised to 17 to 1, and salaries rose from an average of $4,855 to $6,617 per year. It is no accident that faculty salaries in New Mexico are higher than those at comparable institutions in the Mountain States and most of the Great Plains States.

The miracle is that he is able to find time to prepare for classes and do *any* research or writing. It is time to ask how the teacher can be freed of routine, provided with office space, clerical assistance, interns and aides, so that he can do what he was hired to do—teach and study.

THESE examples of four areas that are ripe for change by no means define the limits of higher education's potential for innovation. They merely indicate some of the needs for far-reaching, systematic inquiry and bold changes. However, innovation purely for its own sake, without planning and evaluation, may do more harm than good. If higher education is to reap the full benefit of innovation, two things are needed: regular provision for institutional self-study on a systematic basis and a strategy for change.

At present, there is little machinery for systematic planning and evaluation in our American colleges and universities. True, foundations encourage innovation—indeed they think of themselves as prime agents of change. Though hardly comparable to industry's research budgets, the millions of dollars they spend is impressive in variety and volume. But the experiments they have supported have had only a scatter-shot effect, with negligible influence outside the immediate experimental situation. In fact, not only has there been little impact on other institutions, but generally an experiment in one department on a campus has no impact on other departments in the same institution.

University-supported institutional self-study is in its infancy. Relatively few institutions have a qualified staff responsible on a full-time basis for the full range of institutional research. W. H. Cowley points out that

> not a single institution of which I know . . . has yet established a unit with more than a very limited commission to investigate administrative practices . . . toward the end of rationalizing them and cutting costs. . . . Further, no organization exists in higher education parallel to the American Management Association; the U.S. Office of Education supplies few aids comparable to those which the U.S. Department of Commerce provides business executives; and colleges and universities can subscribe to practically none of the informational and other services which have been available to business organizations for decades.[5]

Even in the relatively few institutions where provision is made for institutional research, the budget allocation has been stingy, and the function is generally limited to the collection of traditional statistics. Very rarely does the institutional research staff tackle such basic problem areas as the learning process, the curriculum, and teaching techniques.

Not only has higher education failed to investigate the possibilities of change, it has shown little concern for the strategy of change. TV lectures may be a success in countless experiments throughout the

[5] "Two and a Half Centuries of Institutional Research," *College Self-Study*, compiled by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (Boulder, Colorado: The Commission, 1960), p. 11.

United States, but the average faculty member clings to his stereotyped ideas and his skepticism. Experiments with class size are legion, but nationally there is little evidence of change in the general faculty attitude that finds small classes intrinsically good and large classes inevitably bad. A number of experiments are under way to conserve teacher time, but teachers were probably never more at a disadvantage in terms of the growing burden imposed on them by inadequate facilities and services.

There were never more self-studies made, yet the dominant pattern is still one of drift and unreflective growth. Why? The convenient scapegoat is the faculty, with its traditions and drives—the stubborn faculty, which blocks curricular reform, clings to the comfortable routines of teaching, looks on televised lectures with cold horror, and generally resists change to the bitter end. Granted, some teachers do take pride in their skill in frustrating the administration, and some old hands have made a real art of this. Good ideas for administration are rarely killed with a sudden merciful blow; they die a lingering death, worn out by endless discussion. On the other hand, a ritual language has developed in academe, and some faculty members believe that the administration regards its faculty as De Rémusat regarded Thiers: "He has much more vanity than ambition; and he prefers consideration to obedience, and the appearance of power to power itself. Consult him constantly and do as you please. He will take more notice of your deference to him than of your actions." A president who seeks to manipulate the faculty only encourages resistance, and thereby brings out the very faculty traits he most dreads. And a faculty which opposes for the sheer joy of triumphant obstruction hardens the heart of the president and makes him only the more determined to work his will on it.

The "stubborn faculty" is a scapegoat best discarded. Although faculties have a unique culture and unique characteristics, the problem of resistance to change is not peculiar to them. One of the central problems industry faces is the worker who is resistant to change—whether at the white-collar, blue-collar, or top-executive level. Even the armed services, with their tradition of discipline, recognize that change is not successful when instituted by fiat. Big organizations have learned at considerable cost that there are no short cuts to purposeful innovation. People—especially academic people—do not change their ideas or ways of working overnight. It is unlikely that change can be successfully imposed on a faculty.

WHAT is the solution? Surely the answer is not simply a new breed of experts on institutional research operating from the president's office. In fact, a grave danger exists that institutional research as presently constituted may become merely another arm of the administration. This is sure to be self-defeating. Purposeful innovation cannot be achieved by pressure from the administration, whether by one-shot studies by outside experts or through a new type of administrative bureaucrat—the institutional-research man.

Every president worth his salt knows that sweeping innovations must be made in higher education in the next decade. He has the facts on projected enrollment at his finger tips; he knows the extent of the teacher shortage; he knows the connection between small classes and the economics of higher education; he knows that needed increases in salaries are linked to over-all productivity. Somehow the president must share his perspective with the faculty and communicate a sense of urgency to them. No strategy of change can succeed unless it is built upon a firm conviction that innovation in the academic community is the responsibility of both administration and faculty.

Faculty members will abandon their illusions and their resistance to change only to the extent that they see and understand the need for change. Successful change is a grass-roots phenomenon. Useful innovation will emerge only as faculty and administration become honest partners in the pursuit of excellence within the institution. Clearly, the university leadership must develop a strategy of change built upon a firm conviction that innovation in the academic community is the shared responsibility of both administration and faculty.

JHE

JHE

SPECIAL OFFER

The Ohio State University Press is happy to announce that for a limited time it is able to offer discerning readers a subscription to the JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION for one year (regular rate: $6.00), together with a copy of its recent publication *American Higher Education in the 1960's* ("Kappa Delta Pi Lecture Series," No. 32), by Robert J. Havighurst (list price: $2.50), at a combined rate of $7.50.

Orders should be marked "special offer."

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
164 WEST NINETEENTH AVENUE
COLUMBUS 10, OHIO

Short Contributions

Children of God

The youngest Indian university, the thirty-eighth, visited by the writer and her husband during recent Fulbright "tours of duty" was Marathwada, established in Aurangabad in the summer of 1958. It is set in an area with a rich literary, religious, and artistic history, but the University's chief claim to distinction is that it ministers to a group composed largely of untouchables—persons who are officially designated as "scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, and other backward classes," but whom Gandhi renamed "Harijans" or "children of God."

The largest of the colleges at Marathwada is Milind Maha Vidyalaya, which had nine hundred students in 1958, and formed the nucleus of the University. It was appropriately named for the famous King Milinda (or Menander), who was given his kingdom by Alexander the Great, and who in a well-known Pali text asks penetrating questions of a Buddhist abbot and in the end is converted to Buddhism. (The second and third words in the name mean "great knowledge institution" or "great college.")

The College was established in 1950 by B. R. Ambedkar (1891–1956), himself an untouchable, who was sponsored at Columbia University by the Gaekwad of Baroda, returned to India as a lawyer, wrote most of the present Indian constitution, and fought continually for the rights of the untouchables to education and to equal treatment with their fellows. Toward the end of his life, in protest against the Gandhian contention that Harijans should constitute a fifth caste, and almost in desperation, he advocated mass conversions to Buddhism among his followers as a means of achieving status by separating themselves completely from the Hindu caste system. Thus, strangely enough, most of the Buddhists in India today (the birthplace of the Buddha) are such converts, seeking self-respect in a religion which itself originated at least partly as a protest against caste 2,500 years ago. It is entirely appropriate that the small but well-equipped college-library reading room should be presided over by an impressive modern plaster figure of the imperturbable Buddha, whose serenity is a continual reminder of his message of peace and of the equality and potential Buddhahood of all men. The students take great pride in the fact that their Principal is himself from the Harijan community, whose members, because of the culturally poor homes from

which they come, seldom win first-class honors and are therefore usually not eligible to compete for foreign scholarships. This man, however, did win a scholarship which enabled him to study English literature in England for three years and hence to return to his country equipped to be a university instructor and administrator.

Teachers at Marathwada are concerned today because the English spoken by their students is substandard, and are therefore stressing the importance of their English Department, even though the main emphasis at the moment is being put upon scientific and technical education, rather than upon the humanities, in an attempt to enable this backward area of India to catch up economically and so provide a better living and more opportunity for its inhabitants to pursue cultural interests related to their glorious past. We noted here somewhat greater difficulty than elsewhere in making ourselves understood by students when we talked with them individually, and we also had some trouble in understanding them. But with a little extra effort on both sides, we were able to communicate successfully. Strangely enough, students listened to our lectures as if they understood them and never failed to laugh at the right places. This difficulty with English was of the same kind we encountered at the local post office in buying stamps. Perhaps it was because the clerks there were working under a sign which read "Service above Self" that we were finally able to complete our transaction successfully.

One of the graduate students, who served as our guide to the Aurangabad Buddhist caves and whose English was above average, had received his A.B. in Commerce and now was earning his living as a guide while attending law classes in the evening. An arrangement of this sort is much rarer in India than in America, but perhaps not in a largely Harijan community, where students have no "face" to lose by being gainfully employed in temporary and often menial jobs. Elsewhere in India, someone had told us in shocked tones about the son of a prominent family who was studying in America and during the summer was working in, of all places, a "petrol" station. We tried to explain that in our country there was nothing anomalous about this, no matter whose son he might be.

As we heard and read about the treatment of untouchables in India, for example in certain southern temples from which they were excluded, we always had one question to which we never received an entirely satisfactory answer. This was, How can one identify an untouchable? Our very closest and most intelligent twice-born friends, after explaining that all the untouchables in a particular vicinity are known to the local temple priests, always fell back on the explanation that there is just "something about" an untouchable that identifies him, or that one somehow recognizes him instinctively. We can imagine that these judgments are based partly on color (the original foundation of the caste system is *varna*, the Sanskrit word for caste meaning "color") and partly on the

social unease which is bound to characterize people who for generations have been excluded and persecuted and made to feel inferior. We sometimes heard stories of successful visits to Hindu temples by untouchables-turned-Christian—usually venturesome college students—and we always gloated inwardly over this subversion of the rigid Hindu system. (If such action were discovered, the whole temple would have to undergo an elaborate purification ceremony!) The only difference we could notice between students at Marathwada and those elsewhere was that those here were much more obviously curious about us as Westerners, that when we visited the library or faculty offices they would drop whatever they were doing to stand and stare and smile at us to a degree which would not have been thought proper in a more sophisticated group. At our lectures, about three hundred students were crowded into a large classroom, some standing in the aisles and others lining the porches on each side and listening through doors and windows; yet in spite of the crowding, there was none of the restlessness we would expect in a comparable American audience, and only an occasional light buzz when the speaker paused to locate a passage of poetry he wanted to read. At the end of each lecture, however, we had the unusual experience of being almost mobbed by autograph-seekers. We learned more intimately about Harijan behavior from this episode than we could have from many books on the subject.

Two incidents will illustrate widely separated reactions to the problems posed in universities by this group. In a south Indian university where, as is required by law, a number of seats are reserved for Harijan students, the authorities found great difficulty in buying a house to be used as a dormitory or hostel for them. Negotiations would proceed successfully until word got around of the purpose for which the building was being bought. At this point, the deal would unaccountably be broken off—the excuse might be that the owner's wife objected to his selling. Finally, a notoriously haunted house was bought, without difficulty, and the boys installed. But another obstacle had to be overcome because no dhobis or washermen would consent to serve these outcastes and so be contaminated. (Dhobis belong to the lowest Hindu caste, the Sudras.) To remedy this situation, a professor and his wife went to the hostel and took a boy's shirt home with them, where the professor washed it and his wife ironed it. Then they returned the clean shirt to the hostel and pointed out that what they had done, the boys could do for themselves. This solved the laundry problem, and thereafter the boys devoted Saturdays to washing and ironing—impressed by the example set them.

A second incident indicates the hard core of prejudice which persists in India, even among otherwise educated people, after more than 3,000 years. Recently in the United States, we were listening, at the home of a friend, to an Indian government officer (who is also a Brahmin) extolling before a group of wide-eyed Americans the virtues of India's ancient and

noble caste system and the essential uneducability of the outcaste community. When my husband, preparatory to countering this with a reference to our contrary experience, began, "Now we lectured to students at Marathwada University———," he was cut short with the devastating rejoinder, "Well, then I don't need to tell *you* exactly what I'm talking about!" It scarcely seemed worth while to precipitate a full-dress debate at this point in the face of such contemptuous and ingrained prejudice.

The Vice-Chancellor, Registrar, and other administrative officers at Marathwada are quite aware of the difficulty, and also the tremendous significance, of the task to which they have set their shoulders in this so-called backward region, which for centuries has been continuously ignored and discriminated against but whose people are now aroused to regain something of the region's ancient prestige and no longer to remain "Rip Van Winkles in an age of Sputniks." It is for this reason that the Registrar has lately been visiting American universities, particularly the land-grant colleges and Tuskegee and Hampton institutes, in order to discover whatever will help his institution to afford a depressed people the kinds of educational opportunities which will bring out their latent ability and will deprive their country no longer of the talents of one-eighth of its citizens.

MARGARET WILEY MARSHALL, *Brooklyn College*

Staff-Study Regulations and Restrictions at the Ph.D. Level in American Universities

A contemplated expansion of the graduate program at the North Dakota Agricultural College, both in terms of course offerings and of type and number of degrees, prompted a comprehensive study of prevailing graduate-school practices in other prominent American universities that were known to have profited from extensive experience. Personal letters were sent to the graduate-school deans of sixty leading American colleges and universities with a simple but specific request that they answer the question, "What restrictions, if any, are imposed on full-time members of your faculty wishing to become candidates for the Ph.D. degree on your campus?" These schools were selected at random from the *Educational Directory, 1958–1959, Part 3, Higher Education*, of the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. The final listing included institutions from thirty states. Forty-four of these institutions were supported by state taxes; ten were privately endowed and supported; and the remaining six were supported from municipal or other public funds. It is significant to note that detailed replies were received from fifty-eight, or 96.7 per cent, of the schools. The only two failing to respond were state tax–supported

institutions. Many administrators supplied complete copies of graduate catalogues and regulations or included detailed discussions of pertinent past experiences, both profitable and otherwise.

After the results were tabulated, it was found that the schools questioned could be conveniently and logically classified in four categories: those that allowed full-time staff members to become candidates for the doctorate, those in which candidacy was permitted theoretically but was rarely undertaken, those that imposed restrictions at the level of associate professor, and those that rigidly enforced well-defined restrictions.

Only three schools placed no degree restrictions on full-time staff members. One was a small midwestern university, one a very large eastern university, and the other a large west-coast institution. Their replies in order may be summarized as follows:

> Full-time employees of the University are limited to six semester-hours per semester and three credit-hours in the summer session.
>
> No restrictions on full-time teachers working toward Ph.D. They get free tuition.
>
> There are no formal restrictions on faculty obtaining advanced degrees. It is unusual [for them to do so].

Five additional institutions theoretically did not restrain full-time faculty members from becoming candidates for the Ph.D. degree, but the privilege was rarely used. The replies make the reasons obvious. A large central university writes, "We do not have any staff members who wish to become candidates for the Ph.D. degree." A large eastern state university sums up the situation as follows: "We impose no restrictions. Ordinarily, a man without a Ph.D. would not be a member of the faculty." An eastern private school states that

> graduate students who were hired before the completion of all work for the Ph.D. are permitted to finish up. They are not permitted to participate in graduate departmental decisions.

Another midwestern university comments,

> Full-time faculty members working for the Ph.D. are restricted to four semester-hours of study. Some departments do not accept full-time teachers for Ph.D. programs.

Finally, a large municipally tax-supported eastern university states that

> in general, graduate students may pursue work leading to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy only if they are full-time students. In practice we have not permitted persons of the rank of assistant professor or higher to pursue work leading to the Doctor of Philosophy degree. We believe that the dangers in this are obvious.

It was found that six schools apply and enforce restrictions at the level of associate professor. Their comments, in general, are self-explanatory. Four midwestern universities report as follows:

> Staff members holding the rank of professor or associate professor cannot become candidates for a degree from this institution.

> Ph.D. candidate cannot take his Ph.D. in the same department in which he holds tenure.
>
> No member of the staff on full-time regular appointment, with the rank of associate professor or above, may be a candidate for a graduate degree at this institution.
>
> No member of the faculty with the rank of associate professor or above or the equivalent rank at the time of completing the requirements may be granted a degree from the University.

Two municipal universities give the following replies:

> Neither professors nor associate professors are permitted to be candidates for advanced degrees here. Assistant professors are excluded by certain schools and departments.
>
> Assistant professors or below may earn graduate degrees from this University.

The remaining forty-four universities, representing 76 per cent of the responses, placed very rigid and definite restrictions on admission of full-time faculty members to candidacy for the Ph.D. degree. In no instance was any individual above the rank of instructor qualified. In many schools, no degree was available at all. In several cases, full-time staff members were permitted to carry a limited amount of course work, provided it was to be used for degree requirements on another campus. However, in general, even this practice was discouraged. A number of extremely significant comments and accounts of revealing experiences were appended to many of the replies. A few are reproduced without specific reference to their source.

> Doctor's degrees may not be awarded to a University faculty member above the rank of instructor by a department in the college in which he is teaching. . . . It [has been] agreed that it is in the best interests of both faculty member and his institution if he secures a leave of absence and obtains his Doctor's degree from another institution rather than attempt to earn it in the college where he is teaching.
>
> No member of the teaching staff of rank of assistant professor or higher shall be granted a graduate degree by the University. As a general policy, no person who has received a degree from the University shall hereafter be employed as a regular member of the faculty in a position which may lead to permanent tenure.
>
> The University has a standing rule of many years that no one above the rank of instructor may be a candidate for any degree the University offers. So far, [we have] had no instructors who are Ph.D. candidates. As a matter of fact, we are thinking of forbidding any faculty member to be [a candidate] for any degree. This is because of embarrassing situations in which a professor has to flunk his own colleague.
>
> A member of the faculty who has tenure is not eligible to receive an advanced degree from the college. It is not our responsibility to provide special opportunities for members of our permanent faculty to earn advanced degrees. . . . We intentionally attempt to prevent inbreeding.
>
> No faculty member of [the] rank of assistant professor or higher and no member of staff . . . is allowed to undertake [a] graduate program for any advanced degree.

> No voting member of the University Academic Senate [instructors with more than two years' service; assistant, associate, and full professors] may become a candidate for a higher degree at this University.
>
> No member of the University faculty is permitted to be a candidate for a degree.
>
> As soon as a faculty member accepts an appointment of assistant professor or higher, he terminates his candidacy for a Doctor's degree at the University.
>
> No member of staff now holding or who ever has held rank of assistant professor or above or any University official may be a candidate for a degree in the Graduate School.
>
> Members of the faculty above the rank of instructor, those with the title of lecturer, any faculty member holding tenure, or any senior administrative officer shall not be eligible to register for graduate work toward the attainment of the Doctor's degree from the University.
>
> Members of the faculty of the University may enroll for graduate courses, but advanced degrees will not be conferred upon anyone with a higher rank than that of instructor.

The findings of this survey very definitely establish the fact that local graduate study by full-time faculty members is highly restricted, or even completely prohibited, in most reputable graduate schools. When there is any deviation, it is usually limited to faculty members who hold the rank of instructor or below. Even part-time course work by full-time staff members is subject to frequent abuse. Local graduate study by full-time staff members for advanced degrees often leads to serious inbreeding, restricted outlook, and narrowness of educational and professional experience. The practice has little to recommend it and much to condemn it. It is unfair professionally and in point of salary to other competing staff members who have obtained degrees through legitimate avenues. When local staff members are deficient in graduate training and degrees, they should make greater use of available provisions for sabbatical leave or financial aid.

As a result of this study and of careful deliberations by the Graduate Council, a Special Committee, and the Graduate Faculty, the following regulation was adopted by the North Dakota Agricultural College: "A member of the staff who holds a rank above instructor, or [the] equivalent, may not receive the degree Doctor of Philosophy from this institution. Staff members may register for graduate work."

RALPH E. DUNBAR

EDITOR'S NOTE: The JOURNAL regrets to inform its readers that Mr. Dunbar, who was dean of the School of Chemical Technology at North Dakota Agricultural College, died on the fifth of September.

Editorial

The Evocation of Talent

The word *education* is in the commonest use. By contrast, the word *evocation* is rarely used. Yet any good high-school Latin scholar could tell us that the root meanings are quite similar. To educate is to *lead* forth; to evoke is to *call* forth. Since the usages of language reflect deeply embedded thought patterns of a culture, perhaps there is something to be learned by exploration of the frequent use of the one concept and the infrequent use of the other.

Both terms involve action. The difference lies in the source of the action. In a literal sense, education is the result of an action the dynamic of which lies with a leader, the educator. The role of the learner is essentially passive—to permit himself to be led forth. The contrast is sharp when we turn to consider evocation. There remains motion in a direction described as forth, but it results from a call, not from a leader. The action is not to follow the leader but to respond to a call. The difference is vital. The learner accepts leadership, while his nameless counterpart initiates his own action in response to the ideas incorporated in a call.

From this brief excursion into etymology, we may turn to ask why Western civilization has had so much use for education and so little for *evocation*. The older cultures from which the civilization of the modern Western nations sprang apparently had little thought about calling forth human beings. It was spirits which were more likely to be evoked. It is equally apparent that they believed the proper action in relation to human beings was to lead them. This implies a difference in status between persons as leaders and as followers. There were the cognoscenti and the neophytes. The distinction in status might apply in the routine of daily life as well as in the more complex matters of theology, law, and medicine. But in every case it acknowledged the authoritative status of leader *vis-à-vis* follower. The fact that contemporary Western civilization has taken the educative function to its bosom and formalized it into a pattern of social structures which occupy the time of more persons than any other single kind of activity betokens the persistence of an authoritarian ingredient from remote times. It is an anomaly worthy of thought that nations which pride themselves on their freedom and democracy use as a principal instrument for the preservation of those attributes an institution to which not a little ancestral authoritarianism still clings.

It may be said, however, that this observation is really of no great significance. Cultures must work with the materials which lie at hand. What they do with these materials, however, is quite a different matter. As it operates today, is education educative in a literal sense, or is it essentially evocative? Does it seek to open up the mind of the learner so that the useful knowledge and wisdom of the ages can simply be absorbed or even poured in? Or does it seek to encourage imaginative response to the stimuli of the environment? In brief, we have here the ancient issue of education as indoctrination by those who know the correct doctrines versus education as the evocation of talent by those who have ideas about the questions to be posed rather than the definitive answers to be given. Which attitude is principally reflected in the behavioral view of education as a major phenomenon of contemporary Western culture?

This is not an easy question to answer. Education does adorn itself with robes of the kind to which contemporary culture gives sanctity. In this respect, it may be likened to mother, home, and country. Yet if one dare risk sacrilege to say so, it will have to be admitted that a preponderant segment of modern education is plain, undiluted indoctrination. It is understandable—and perhaps forgivable—that this should be true in the early years of school experience. But it is disturbing to find a Bachelor with an honor-society key who exhibits no quality of mind so strongly as the willingness to absorb what teachers and textbook writers tell him it is important to absorb. Even more disturbing is the graduate student who, having added professional motivation to his baccalaureate outlook, regards the teacher as unfair who judges his work on the basis of the critical analyses which he can develop rather than his easy familiarity with the personalities, concepts, and data which give substance to his chosen field of specialization.

It is not suggested that intellectual security in a doctrinaire position is characteristic of all the products of the educational system in America, or even that it is characteristic of many to a high degree. Doubtless, indoctrination must always be a substantial element in any educational system if succeeding generations of the young are to move smoothly into the social positions from which time successively erodes the aging. All that is contended is that the essential spirit of the free democratic nations of the West is not exemplified in an educational system that is only educative in the literal or indoctrinating sense. Rather, this essential spirit of intellectual freedom requires for its nourishment the continual evocation of individual talent through accepted institutional arrangements. Such institutions possess, and can thus bestow, sufficient social status to ensure favorable initial response to those flights of creative fancy by which the human potential emerges to solid reality. The fundamental question comes next: Is there any hope of incorporating such imaginative ideas into the operating structures of society, as they must be if they are to become real?

The biologists suggest that this question is paramount in importance but is a difficult one to answer. It is estimated that of all the species of plants and animals that have ever existed on earth, only a very small fraction are now alive. Of living species, man alone has entrusted his fate to culture rather than to biological structures. The demand for survival which bears upon culture requires adaptation to changing conditions. If we permit education to be limited to indoctrination in the ancient wisdom, we deny it the opportunity to lead our culture toward a free adaptability which is the only assurance of its survival. From the long-term point of view of the biologist, the capacity to produce the behavioral innovations required by environing conditions is the sole means by which any species can survive. In man's case, with trust reposed in a centralized nervous system capable of varied response to stimuli from the environment, behavioral innovations must come from previously unmade, or unrecognized, responses. It must be the individual, in the first instance, who exhibits such innovations. Society has the physical power to save or to destroy them. Will it refuse to permit contamination of the ancient wisdom? Or will it provide a congenial institutional environment in which the worth of innovations may be assessed, regardless of their nature? Those which measure up as instruments of human adaptation may then be added to the ancient wisdom.

This is the ultimate question of social survival—which is to say, of human survival. Considering the gravity of the issue, little serious thought has been given to it in contemporary society. Perhaps the environing conditions which permit the clear formulation of the question are too recent to have permitted much attention to such a problem in such a context. Even so, there is no time to waste. No argument is required to demonstrate the fragility of contemporary society. Man has lost the dogged durability of the single-celled animal. It has become a first order of human business to reduce the random variability of human behavior. We need a sense of direction that we have not had in sufficient strength. A social environment favorable to the emergence of creative thought and action must be established. We need—with all the powers we possess—to evoke the talents of individuals. For the performance of all these related tasks, where lies a greater responsibility than with higher education in its organized capacity?

R. D. P.

The Reporter

THE University of Chicago has announced the establishment of the Public Affairs Conference Center. The purpose of the Center "is to meet the need for bettering the interchange of ideas and knowledge between responsible men of affairs and men who devote their lives to study." Conferences will be held several times during the year on subjects which are immediately relevant to political life. The topic of the first conference, to be held in January, 1961, is "Federalism."

THE Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants, which administers the graduate-student exchange program between the United States and the U.S.S.R., has announced that applications for grants for advanced study in the Soviet Union are now being accepted. Graduate students enrolled for an advanced degree at the time of application, postdoctoral researchers, and university faculty members who are not over forty years of age and are American citizens are eligible. Proficiency in Russian at the time of application is required of those in the field of Russian studies; those in other fields who are not proficient in Russian must be willing to take intensive summer courses to attain proficiency. The full academic year is the usual period of study, but periods of from five to fifteen months can be arranged. In almost all cases, the Soviet Union has permitted the husband or wife, but not the children, of a participant to accompany him. The applicant's financial resources determine the amount of aid he receives. Fellowships from other sources may be applied toward participation in the program. Application forms may be obtained from the Committee, Box 70, Indiana University, and must be filled out and submitted by January 5, 1961.

THE American Civil Liberties Union has sent a memorandum to the one hundred and five colleges and universities which protested the disclaimer affidavit contained in the loan program of the National Defense Education Act. The Union has urged them to join with it in rejecting the substitute which was attached as an amendment to the Kennedy-Clark-Javits bill, which would have repealed the disclaimer provision. The amendment (introduced by Senator Prouty of Vermont) would have retained a political test for those applicants who within the last five years had been members of an organization which advocated the seizure or overthrow of any government unit by the use of force or violence. It required students to submit a written sworn statement of their past membership in such organizations and their knowledge of the objectives of these organizations or incur a heavy fine or a period of imprisonment.

The Union holds that the Prouty amendment is not an adequate improvement over the disclaimer provision and that a political test is not

compatible with academic freedom. Although the bill as amended died in the House Education Committee, it is believed that new attempts will be made to remove the political-test provision in the next Congress, and that knowledge of the continued opposition of colleges and universities to the disclaimer would be influential in bringing about its rejection.

THE Fund for Adult Education, established by the Ford Foundation as an independent organization in 1951, has announced that it will cease operation in 1961. The Educational Division of the Ford Foundation will assume its functions. Since its establishment, the Fund has received a total of $47 million from the Ford Foundation. It will award the $4 million which remains to colleges, universities, and certain national organizations to advance liberal adult education, with particular emphasis on expanding educational opportunities for present and potential leaders in public life.

Two Chinese-language textbooks are being prepared at Cornell University in a project approved under the National Defense Education Act. A handbook of literary Chinese and a social-science reader have been given priority in the language-development program, which was established as a part of the Act to expand and improve foreign-language facilities in the United States.

The literary handbook is designed to give students of modern Chinese a knowledge of the structure of literary Chinese that will enable them to recognize literary forms when they occur in vernacular texts; to understand simple literary and historical allusions, quotations, and documents; and to use Chinese dictionaries and reference works. The social-science reader will include writings of the past thirty years in the fields of anthropology, history, economics, political science, and sociology. It is intended for use in the second year of study, and will include vocabularies, annotations, and grammar exercises.

THE third year of Continental Classroom, the college-level science course televised by the National Broadcasting Company, is being devoted to a study of contemporary mathematics. Modern Algebra is being given the first semester, and Probability and Statistics will be given during the second semester.

To encourage enrollment for credit, the course is divided into two sections. Lessons telecast on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 6:30 to 7:00 A. M. are required for college students seeking undergraduate credit. Teachers and others enrolled for graduate credit in schools of education are required to view telecasts five days a week. The sessions on Tuesday and Thursday cover methods of teaching modern algebra in secondary school. The same pattern will be followed during the second semester for the course Probability and Statistics. The textbook used in the first semester is *Modern Algebra*, written by John L. Kelley, head of the Department of Mathematics at the University of California, Berkeley, who is also the teacher of the course.

Last year's course on Continental Classroom, Modern Chemistry, is being repeated this fall from 6:00 to 6:30 A. M.

A REPORT entitled "The Preparation and Education of Foreign Students in the U.S.S.R." has recently been issued by the U.S. Office of Education. Several observations contained in the description of the Soviet program are of particular interest. The offering

of preparatory programs in the Russian language and in the general background necessary for successful university work is proving to be a highly attractive feature of education in the Soviet Union for foreign students, particularly those from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Although enrollments of foreign students in the U.S.S.R. will continue to increase rapidly, it is unlikely that the totals will approach the number of foreign students educated in the United States in the near future. However, the Soviet Union may approach, and perhaps surpass, United States enrollments of students from certain countries in the less developed areas of the world.

THE Southern Fellowships Fund, which is an agency of the Council of Southern Universities, Inc., has announced that dissertation-year fellowships for dissertation research and writing during 1961–62 are available for faculty members in institutions of higher education in the following states: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia. This is the only type of fellowship the Fund is offering this year. Awards will be made primarily to applicants in the fields of the biological and physical sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities; applications for study in the professional fields will be considered only if such study is undertaken for the purpose of becoming a teacher.

Only those persons are eligible "who are giving or assisting in giving courses of instruction [in institutions of higher education] for which students receive academic credit" or who are members of the administrative staff. They must have completed residence, course, and language requirements for the Ph.D. or an equivalent degree, have passed the qualifying examinations, and have begun work on their dissertations. Persons who do not hold the rank of instructor or above, must, in addition, have had one academic year of experience in college teaching by February 1, 1961, and must make a declaration of intent to follow a career in higher education in the South.

Married fellowship winners will receive stipends of $3,000 for nine months, or $3,600 for twelve months, of study; unmarried winners will receive stipends of $2,500 for nine months or $3,000 for twelve months. Applications must be submitted by December 15, 1960. More complete information and application forms may be obtained from Robert M. Lester, Executive Director, Southern Fellowships Fund, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

A REPORT has been issued by Yale University on the success of its teaching-fellow program in recruiting outstanding college Seniors to careers in teaching. Of the eighteen men who have held Carnegie Teaching Fellowships, eleven have decided on graduate study and careers in teaching. The University plans to continue the program with its own funds when the grant from the Carnegie Corporation is exhausted in another year.

During their year of teaching undergraduate courses, Carnegie Fellows are enrolled in the Yale Graduate School for advanced work. If, at the end of the fellowship period, they decide on careers in teaching, they register for a regular Ph.D. degree program.

THE School of Education of the University of Southern California has begun a new two-year program which is designed to improve teacher training and reduce the time required for it.

Fifty-one graduate students who are beginning study for the Master's degree will work as paid teacher-assistants in the public-school system of Los Angeles. The University and the school system are equal partners in the project.

In the first year of the program, in addition to their regular course schedule, the participants, who are called specialist-teachers, will serve as teacher-assistants for three hours a day during the first semester; in the second semester, they will be teacher-assistants for two hours a day and student-teachers for one hour. In the second year of the program, they will serve either as half- or full-time teaching interns during the first semester, and as full-time teaching interns with their own teacher-assistants during the second semester. The specialist-teachers are assured full-time positions in the Los Angeles school system on graduation. The program is supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

MEMBERS of the faculty of Michigan State University are participating in the development of the University of Nigeria, which was officially dedicated this fall. Under a contract with the International Co-operation Administration of the U.S. Department of State, M.S.U. is joining with the Inter-University Council of Great Britain in advising the Nigerian government on the academic program and in providing faculty members until the University is firmly established. A member of the M.S.U. faculty is acting principal of the institution.

The new university will be patterned after the land-grant institutions in the United States, with a program of education, research, and extension services. Its first course offerings are in the liberal arts. Programs in agriculture, engineering, education, and science will gradually be added. Primary emphasis is placed on training Nigerian staff members. The initial enrollment of 250 students is expected to increase to 10,000 in ten years.

Vanderbilt and the Lawson Case

A committee representing broad university interests has prepared a statement covering principles and procedures to be applied in the future at Vanderbilt University in cases involving academic freedom and conscientious scruple. This is a direct result of the now-closed Lawson case, which caused a prolonged controversy receiving wide attention. Whatever the merits of the case—and the rights were not all on one side—it is clear that an established procedure such as is now authorized by the approved committee report would have saved the University embarrassment and turmoil. Copies of the report may be obtained from Graduate Dean Leonard B. Beach, chairman of the Committee.

The net effect of the affair may well be favorable to the program of integration at the university level in the South. Vanderbilt maintains its uninterrupted policy (established in 1953) of accepting Negroes in its professional schools when no other institution offering a comparable opportunity is available in the region. The administration and faculty of the University are agreed that this policy should not involve any weakening of standards, whether academic or moral. Chancellor Branscomb's insistence on respect for law has been demonstrated as being in no way incompatible with his insistence on respect for academic freedom.

LEONARD B. BEACH
Vanderbilt University

EDITOR'S NOTE: Readers are invited to submit items not exceeding two hundred words in length for "The Reporter." Those which are of general interest will be published with a caption and signature. They should deal with significant ideas, events, or experiences.

Reviews

IS THE WORLD OUR CAMPUS?, *by Walter Adams and John A. Garraty.* East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1960. xi+180 pp. $3.75.

Is the World Our Campus? is a good title, but the reader will not find the answer in this book. The authors undertake, through reporting an interview survey financed by the Carnegie Corporation, to appraise the effectiveness of the overseas programs of American universities which operate as a part of the technical-assistance program of the United States. The basic weakness of the book is revealed in the ambitious title and in the introductory statement of broad purpose, as contrasted with the limited area and small number of institutions observed (selected from Europe and Turkey for 1957–58).

The authors candidly state that their report "is reliable only to the extent that the composite views of our respondents represent an accurate and balanced picture of American university programs abroad" (page x), but they proceed to generalize as if this qualification did not matter. Occasionally there is a concession to scholarly reservation by reference to the point that the examples used may not be conclusive evidence; but these attempts to reflect a balanced point of view are buried by the illustrative material and by the journalistic style. Indeed, one would expect to find the kind of feature writing employed here in a newspaper or magazine rather than under the imprint of a university press. One has the feeling the authors were trying to develop the Academic American as a companion to the Ugly American.

It is an old trick in popular writing or controversy to generalize from examples and to be dogmatic or assertive about the unproved conclusions. In my view, this approach has no place in the scholarly treatment of a subject as serious and important as this one.

There are few main points in the book unknown to any serious observer or administrator in the contract programs. Every university program has been beset with many of the difficulties, frustrations, disappointments, and doubts which are described here. Nonetheless, the universities of America are devoted to these programs because they see values and outcomes in them which get short shrift in this report.

It is regrettable that the sensational treatment, the unsupported generalizations, the partial view, the weak argumentation, and the irrelevant editorial flights of the authors on such subjects as John Dewey and the case method obscure the solid portions of the book. There is much thoughtful analysis which could be helpful to the uninitiated—the discussions, for example, of the need for co-operative planning between the overseas and American institutions involved, the qualifications required for overseas personnel, the importance of supervision and "tight" administration, the need for patience and perspective.

The book could have been a constructive handbook in orienting overseas personnel and enlarging public understanding.

Instead of being constructively critical, however, as it purports to be, the book brings the whole overseas educational effort under sensationally negative treatment. The book was used, for example, to give a national news magazine a story, with the lead, "Now it is American professors who are coming under fire for their conduct overseas. High living . . . bad manners . . . waste and confusion . . . . Universities abroad are not getting much benefit from the program—and neither is the U. S." The account was illustrated with drawings on luxury living, overdrinking, arrogant behavior, confused planning. A newspaper with national circulation stated that "neglect and poor planning by American universities and their foreign counterparts have seriously damaged the United States program of academic assistance abroad, two professors reported following an international survey."

The authors may object that they are not responsible for these reports which dwell upon the negative. Any casual reader of the book, however, would agree that they have invited this kind of treatment when they use a chapter heading, "Planning, Coordination, and Blind Man's Bluff" or make a point in this manner: "They were naïve enough to expect results from this small-scale, short-run effort devoid of continuity or follow-through. It was as though a boxer hoped to win the heavyweight championship with a single, powderpuff jab in the first round" (page 46). Again, "Two years abroad sounds good as a 'recruiting pitch' but, as the old saying goes, there is no such thing as a free lunch" (page 116).

For those seriously interested in objective discussion of the universities' "contracts abroad," there are, fortunately, many other books and monographs. *Is the World Our Campus?* is recommended by this reviewer chiefly to those with responsibility in administration and interpretation of the programs. They should have first-hand knowledge of the criticisms which will now come to their work from those opposed to foreign aid in general, who will now have "proof" from the examples set forth under the guise of responsible academic study.

David D. Henry
University of Illinois

God Bless Our Queer Old Dean, *by W. Storrs Lee.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959. 256 pp. $3.95.

This book by W. Storrs Lee, former dean of men at Middlebury College, is described on its jacket as "an amusing, informative book for anyone who went to college or plans to do so." This is an appropriate, brief description which might be extended considerably.

The Preface by President Robert M. Strozier of Florida State University, "The Dean at Work—and Play," the keynote address at the 1958 Conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators by the former dean of students at the University of Chicago, provides the setting for the chapters which follow.

In these, Mr. Lee presents a general statement of the wide range of functions, duties, and responsibilities of the student personnel dean, and then devotes himself to descriptions, discussions, historical background, case studies, and serious and amusing anecdotes—all with comments on the dean as the representative of the president, guardian of students, educator, counselor, administrator, disciplinarian, exemplar and idealist, benefactor, and campus scapegoat.

This is not a textbook. Yet it is a book which will be used in survey work and as a general reference, and one which should be read by a great many people. It will provide the alumni of any institution with humorous, nostalgic reminders of incidents and personalities. Many institutions are cited, and many well-known campus personalities are mentioned and quoted. The alumnus will either identify himself with an incident mentioned or at once recall a situation which is comparable and better.

It is possible that a preparatory-school student readying himself for college or the university might get the idea from this book that there is a very light side of college and university life, but if he will read carefully, he will discover that there are also serious aspects which place heavy responsibilities on the student. The book might well be required reading for parents of students about to enter college. They would gain a better understanding of what they might expect from the institution for their sons and daughters.

The undergraduate student in residence who has difficulty in understanding the rules, regulations, and policies of his institution would benefit from a careful reading of the book. His perspective on the relations of the student, the faculty, and the administration might be clarified, and his part in communication might be improved.

The book should be read by every person who is considering student personnel work as a profession or who is already in the profession. If he is considering a choice between generalist and specialist in student personnel work, he will find that the point of view of the author is that of the generalist, and that the responsibilities of the generalist may be somewhat different from those of the specialist. He will also discover that while there can be joys and satisfactions in such work, there can be tragedy, frustration, and misunderstandings. But he will be assured that few dull moments are in prospect for him.

To readers who are involved in higher educational work of any kind, particularly in any phase of administration, the book will give peculiar satisfaction. Dean Lee has cited happenings common to people in such positions, and his sympathetic handling of these matters will provide convincing evidence that, in spite of everything, this is work which can give personal satisfaction far beyond any other reward.

FRED H. TURNER
University of Illinois

WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS THINK, *by Rose K. Goldsen et al.* Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1960. xxviii+240 pp. $5.95.

This volume adds significant evidence to that of several other evaluative studies of the results of higher education which have been published in recent years. Broadly viewed, it gives quantified support to the picture of uneven student attainments with which we have become familiar. Indeed, to this reviewer, these studies all add up to the strong impression—if so good, why not better? And we become aware of another question—as we enlarge college enrollments, are we likely to dilute educational achievement, to hold the line, or to improve in the performance required to fulfill necessary and valid objectives?

The present study is based upon inquiries into the beliefs and attitudes of some 4,800 students, of whom nearly 3,000 were intensively examined. Although the greater number of students in the sample are from

Cornell University, there is also a 6–per cent sample of eleven student bodies chosen from "influential types of universities," but not necessarily from the most representative types. Apart from the sampling at Cornell, only male students were questioned. This careful definition of the limits of the study restricts the significance of the evidence obtained without detracting from its usefulness.

The busy educator, administrator, dean, and department head (all of whom should study the findings of this book) will find that Chapter I, "The Student Looks at College Education," and Chapter IX, "Some General Observations," supply a good overview of facts and findings and an introduction to numerous refinements of further analysis. Between these two chapters, there is a more detailed discussion of the attitudes of students toward choice of a career, the fraternity systems, sex relations, international matters, religion, and so on.

On the whole, the findings in these several areas are neither novel nor startling, albeit they are somewhat disillusioning when supported by the actual number of student responses. The study does not pretend to offer correctives; but the evidence it supplies, or at least suggests, should lead to considerable self-searching on the part of those responsible for education. When all is said, it is no alibi for confused or indifferent educational quality to say that American education reflects, and is modified by, American society. Of course this is true. But this book joins with other recent studies in posing the question, Cannot higher education rise from a pedestrian to a more prophetic role?

What does our society value? How can it be brought to elevate its values? How can higher education clarify the personal, social, and spiritual values of young people in the direction of dedicated action? The study gives rise to this type of question.

This volume has illuminating insights for all college educators who are willing to explore courageously the better ways ahead.

ORDWAY TEAD
Board of Higher Education, New York City

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE: PROGRESS AND PROSPECT, *by Leland L. Medsker.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960. xiv+367 pp. $6.50.

Partly because the junior or community college is the most recent arrival on the higher educational scene, much of the already extensive literature concerning it is descriptive or polemic. Medsker's volume will undoubtedly serve as a landmark, since his presentation is based on meticulous and intelligently critical examination of the objectives and functions of the junior college, and his conclusions rest largely on carefully designed and executed research studies. The volume is a highly creditable addition to the publications emanating from the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of California at Berkeley.

Medsker's long and intimate association with junior-college operation in Chicago and California makes him particularly well qualified to analyze the institution in its many facets. The challenge to those associated with this educational enterprise he sets forth on page 88:

> Its variety of students, its close relationship to the public schools as well as the four-year colleges, and its multiplicity of functions place the junior college in a unique situation and create for its staff a heavy responsibility to plan and implement the most appropriate instructional program.

In the light of this challenge, he examines the public junior college dispassionately. He finds that in spite of many excellent practices and services, it is not measuring up to the expectations held for it in a number of important respects. He then proceeds to a further examination of the reasons for this state of affairs.

There is widespread agreement that the major functions of the junior college are (1) terminal vocational education, (2) pre-transfer liberal-arts education, (3) general education, (4) educational and vocational guidance, (5) adult education. This is indeed a formidable assignment, but the forces shaping the junior college have combined to press these expectations upon it.

Medsker's conclusion concerning terminal education, which is generally regarded as a particular hallmark of junior-college education, is sobering and disappointing: "In other words, the contention that the junior college devotes much of its energy to the terminal program is substantiated neither by the objective data revealed in the study nor by the observations made in the majority of the institutions visited" (pages 24–25). His conclusion concerning guidance functions is even more devastating: "The failure of the junior college in this important responsibility could well mean that the growing dependence on this institution is in error" (page 26). The third dart is less of a suprise: "The information gathered in the process of the study revealed that in the majority of two-year colleges relatively little had been done to meet the objectives of general education" (page 26).

In the light of these carefully assessed criticisms, a superficial judgment might be that the junior college has largely failed in its mission, and accordingly should be strait-jacketed or left to flounder. A more discerning judgment would be that the treatment provided by Medsker is like that of a skilled medical doctor—there must be intensive diagnosis if the patient is to receive effective treatment. And part of the cure, as the author so correctly underscores, is that the junior college must develop an identity of its own and an integrity in terms of its objectives and operations.

Although Medsker takes pains to document also the positive contributions, many junior-college adherents will be antagonized by the bluntness of his criticisms. It is this reviewer's judgment, however, that through his careful investigation and analysis the author has performed an invaluable service to those very persons who will be most discomfited by his report.

H. Taylor Morse
University of Minnesota

Just Published:

DANIEL COIT GILMAN AND THE PROTEAN Ph.D.:

The Shaping of American Graduate Education

by FRANCESCO CORDASCO

An important new book in which Dr. Cordasco argues that the American Ph.D. and American graduate education were largely defined by Daniel Coit Gilman, first president of the Johns Hopkins University. The influence of the German *Wissenschaftslehre* tradition is rejected, and Dr. Cordasco maintains that reform of American graduate education can only be achieved by an understanding of its historical origins.

160 pages, cloth 18 Florins [$4.80]
paper bound 15 Florins [$4.00]

Published by:

E. J. Brill, Publisher,
LEIDEN, THE NETHERLANDS
Payment through our New York bankers